

Right Now!

Issue 58

August 2006

£2.95

A magazine of politics, ideas and culture

USA: \$5.00
Australia: \$7.00

Opening the floodgates – the Netherlands confronts Islamism



Plus

Interviews: Taki and Ezra Mishan

The spectre of the white working class

**Box 361,
78 Marylebone
High Street,
London,
W1U 5AP, UK.****Tel/fax:
(0845) 601 3243****E-mail:
editor@right-now.org****Website:
www.right-now.org****Patrons:**

The Rt. Hon. Viscount
Massereene and Ferrard
The Rt. Hon. Lord Deramore
Brian Crozier
Professor Antony Flew
Professor Paul Gottfried
Professor David Marsland
Professor Ezra Mishan
Professor Thomas Molnar
Professor Dwight D Murphy
Peter D Robinson, MP
Fr. James Thornton

Editor:

Derek Turner

US Editor:

Matthew Richer

Contributing Editors:

Roger Alsop
Angela Ellis-Jones
Stuart Millson
Marco Respinti (Milan)
G V Shugg

© Copyright 2006
Right Now!

Opinions expressed in bylined
articles are the authors' own,
and should not be taken
to represent the editorial
viewpoint of Right Now!

Printed, published and
distributed by Right Now
Press Limited, Box 361,
78 Marylebone High St,
London, W1U 5AP, UK.

Right Now! complies with the
Data Protection Act, 1998.
Records may be held on and
processed by a computer
database.

A political primal scream

Race has clearly become one of the most important issues of our time. From the *Daily Mail* to the *Independent*, and from Trevor Phillips to Sir Andrew Green, many are suddenly concerned about the effects of large-scale immigration and multiculturalism on Britain's social cohesion, cultural viability, political stability, foreign policy, infrastructure, crime levels and the environment. After decades of silence and fear on this subject, there is a refreshing openness about these discussions – as if a political primal scream had claimed attention and cleared the air.

The chief impulse behind these discussions has been, inevitably, the events of 9/11 and 7/7. Another galvanising factor has been the rise of the BNP which has acted as a kind of political enzyme and had a profound, if indirect, influence on politicians' rhetoric. Labour politicians in inner-city areas are suddenly concerned about their future careers. A smaller number of Labour politicians have raised these issues out of a sincere – if belated – realisation that a massive problem has stolen upon the country, and may devour us all. Amid predictions that almost three million more people will seek to enter Britain within the next two years, it requires almost wilful blindness not to be interested in this problem.

But there are still economists who want mass immigration to solve mythical 'skills shortages' or fund pension schemes. There are still Leftist columnists who agonise over the problems of the Third World, and who believe these can be best alleviated by permitting substantial numbers of Third Worlders to enter Britain – although their concern does not extend to private financial assistance, or offers to welcome "the wretched of the earth" into their own homes. There are still *Daily Mail* journalists who rant about asylum-seeker criminals one moment, then write lachrymose stories about "little Abdul, who is being sent back to a war-torn land" – with the result that little Abdul ends up staying in the UK, along with his entire family. There are still ministers who say they want to sort out the mess, but hide behind civil servants, procedures and the courts when it comes to taking action. Tony Blair is ostensibly concerned about multiculturalism, yet simultaneously plans more state-funded Muslim schools. There is the 'Conservative Party', now planning to weaken its already weak immigration policies. (As usual, Tory strategists are behind the times, and are trying to be PC when it has become unfashionable.) Too much of the discussion of these issues is still superficial and angst-ridden. Finally, even within the ranks of the small but growing army of people who really want to *do* something

about the immigration imbroglio, there is mutual suspicion and party-political point-scoring.

It is necessary to drive forward this halting, apologetic debate. As well as by now mainstream grumbling about 'numbers' and why illegal immigration has helped to bring into contempt the rule of law, we urgently require clear-eyed analysis of what the imprecise term 'race' means in practical political terms. Those who are seriously concerned about this subject should welcome honest investigation by historians, statisticians, geneticists, evolutionary psychologists and cultural commentators. A few examples of the searching questions that need urgently to be asked (and answered) can easily be adduced.

How should 'race' be defined? Is race really just 'a social construct', or are there really meaningful physical differences between races? What is patriotism? Can patriotism be purely 'civic', or does it require a physical and tribal underpinning? Why do "birds of a feather flock together"? Has Britain really always been the multicultural society of post-modern belief? What difference does primary – and second-generation – immigration make to crime figures? What are the qualitative differences between immigration from Poland and Pakistan? What are the effects of 'diversity' on psychic health and group psychology? And, crucially, how can we avoid a dangerous situation getting completely out of hand, with potentially dreadful consequences?

Large-scale intergroup hostility has been held in check to date because the numbers involved were small, and there was a vestigial culture of tolerance. But now the numbers involved are great, and political politesse is dying. Our institutions have been diluted of their meaning and sapped of their strength, and our continuing capitulation is (correctly) being seen by non-Western eyes as chronic cowardice. The ethnic isobars are piling up to the East and South, and non-Western weather fronts are roaring in to fill the low pressure areas to the West. As the Fabian Society put it recently, "British identity is up for grabs". And it is not just Britain, but also France, Spain, Portugal, Germany, Russia and America that stand on the edge of an ethnic abyss, as their populations alter for ever and not necessarily for the better.

We are all now in an unenviable, unhappy situation, and must find our way as well as we can, if we are to stave off disaster. The billion-dollar, burning question now for everyone, as members of discrete groups and as individuals, is how we can co-exist in a shrinking world without losing our ancient and irreplaceable identities. □

Greek fire

Derek Turner interviews **Taki Theodoracopulos**, sybarite, scapegrace – and old school conservative

Your opposition to the war in Iraq is well known. Having got into this mess, what can the Americans do in Iraq and Afghanistan?

The only thing that has surprised me about this war is that I was completely right! Having read *Winston's Folly*¹ and having lived in that part of the world, I don't think either Afghanistan or Iraq can work. There is nothing anyone can do. There is nothing I would like more than if we could pacify this part of the world but I simply don't see any way out. I hope I am wrong.

What I am really upset about is that the chief architect of the Iraq war, Wolfowitz, has been kicked upstairs², and that the neo-cons have not lost a scintilla of credibility. They continue to scream that Rumsfeld didn't do enough, that we should have killed more Iraqis and poured in more troops. AIPAC³ has silenced virtually all opposition, by calling it "anti-American" – including we of the *American Conservative*.

What could America do to try to calm things down in relation to Palestine?

I have been very wrong about that in the past. I have always said that we should go back to the 1967 border, and then the Palestinians and Arabs will fall into line. If it was only as simple as that even the Israelis might have done it!

Because of our unfairness towards the Palestinians over the years, we have made the Arabs truly, truly hate the West. After Eisenhower had driven the Anglo-French and the Israelis back from Suez in 1956, I went to Egypt. When people heard me speaking with an American accent, they came up and patted me on the back. When the Marines landed in Lebanon in 1958, they were cheered by everybody – Left and Right, Arabs and Christians. It is an amazing thing that since then we have managed to become so hated. I just hope against hope that Israel will see the light one day and stop the nasty settlers, most of whom are American. Those are the extremists.

In a 2002 interview with Backpage.com, you said "I've had 35 years as a journalist; now I want a little bit more gravitas". What were the other reasons for the founding of the American Conservative – and what have been its achievements to date?

We founded it because Pat Buchanan, having opposed the Israeli influence on American foreign policy, was marginalised immediately by his great friend and my benefactor William Buckley⁴. People like Gertrude Himmelfarb put pressure on Bill to get rid of Pat Buchanan, Joe Sobran and other people on the Old Right, saying they were anti-Semites who were hiding their anti-Semitism by pretending to be anti-Zionist. Bill was the father of modern conservatism and fought bravely to bring conservatism into the mainstream. I guess he had to go along with this. People in America are very scared to say or write or do anything to criticise the state of Israel.

Pat put us on the map. He sold us eight hundred,

or a thousand, straight off. We got 6,000 just like that and now we're up to between 12,000 and 15,000 readers.

You were unlikely collaborators in some ways.

Yes, because I have been busted for drugs and spent time in jail for it, 22-23 years ago. And as Pat has pointed out, I'm a womaniser and he's not! He is anti-immigration and I'm a so-called immigrant, although I didn't exactly come across the Rio Grande! Actually I came over on my yacht! That didn't go down too well with envious hacks!

Which other US journals do you respect?

I still like *National Review* but not when I read ridiculous people like Jonah Goldberg asking for us to attack Iran. It was the magazine that made me, and gave me my first break. During the 40th anniversary they had portraits of all the people that started at *National Review*. They had a picture of George Will bent studiously over a typewriter, and Tom Wolfe doing something else equally studious and then a picture of me skiing! It's a horrible thing for me to agree more now with Gore Vidal than *National Review*. I also love *Chronicles*. For me, it makes more sense than any other magazine. It's a pity it has limited circulation because it reads like a dream and they are not afraid to say things⁵.

In the same Backpage interview, you sound as if you would like to like Bush. You said he is essentially the prisoner of the neo-conservatives.

Apparently, on a personal level there is no one nicer than Bush senior and Bush junior to talk to – if you're out on a picnic for instance. But I'm afraid I was wrong about his being a prisoner. The Christian Right got to him, and he actually believes this bullshit about a Second Coming. If he still hasn't figured it out he'll

Continued overleaf



get a real drubbing at the election. It's time for him to go at the next election – at least I hope he will!

Moving to British politics, what do you make of David Cameron?

I'm not at all in favour of him. I know a lot of people who are very close to him who are also friends of mine. I think Cameron is just another politician and a bullshitter – and he looks ridiculous too! Please quote that.

I am completely disgusted with English politics. Once you have Mr Trevor Phillips telling you what you should do, who you should hire in the police, who you should hire in businesses and schools, what do you expect? I've never seen anything like it! How can you say people here shouldn't vote for the BNP? If I was poor, I'd be the biggest BNP supporter. What is this crap? Journalists who live in Belgravia and cheat on their expenses are giving us morality lessons.

There is a total disregard for anything that the man in the street wants. The people have been slowly put to sleep by watching football and these oiks they see on television. I've never seen such patriotic fervour as we have just seen with the football, but of course if you asked the people to turn around and throw out these crooks they wouldn't do it; they only love football. One day it will be written down that while England watched football, the Muslims came in and took over the country!

It's desperately sad. I don't think Churchill would have allowed it, or Macmillan or any of those people. Certainly, Lady Thatcher wouldn't have wanted this to happen. Trevor Phillips seems like a very reasonable fellow but he has his own agenda. He wants more black people but this happens to be a white, Christian country.

Is the EU salvageable, and should it be salvaged?

In 1961, I was on a first class flight Comet from Athens to Rome. I met my cousin, who was also flying first class. He was younger than me and he was extremely poor because his parents were academics, so I asked him, "How wonderful to see

you! How come you're flying first class?" It turned out that he was being paid to attend a summit about the possibility of Greece entering the Common Market – 20 years before we joined! I saw the waste then and there. My cousin going first class to Rome to stay in a smart hotel, to eat and drink for a week to discuss something that might happen to Greece in the future! That was such corruption; that's why Jimmy Goldsmith wanted to expose it. And nothing has happened. They fired the whistleblower⁶. EU criminality and waste is so blatant that people are tired of hearing it, and so they don't do anything about it. No matter how many times you scream "whore, whore, whore!" after a while you stop screaming, and she continues to be a prostitute! It is typical of democracy; the moment they get to power they give you two fingers. I wish Jimmy Goldsmith was still around. He had the means and the balls to fight these people.

What are your thoughts on the present 'conservative' Greek government and its support for Turkish entry into the EU?

Can you imagine? Karamanlis is supposed to be Right-of-centre. Why does he want to bring 70 million Muslims into Europe? I don't know what game he is playing. I want the Turks out of Europe. In Greece, we are only 10 million people, yet a million Muslims have come in through Albania, but I have never seen better behaved Muslims because the Greek Church is so strong – unlike the ridiculous Church of England.

I love it when European politicians like Karamanlis ask me for money – the pleasure it gives me to say, "Not a penny! I'd rather give it to the Albanians, to the Chechens, or the North Koreans!"

You often denounce Marc Rich, the Russian oligarchs and similar greedy tycoons. Isn't that kind of ultra-capitalism inherent in Reaganism and indeed Thatcherism?

It is! It is! But I reserve the right at 69 and something years to change my mind. My father fought for capitalism and against national socialism, and put his money, his mouth and his body on the line. But the idea that a crook like Marc Rich⁷, who was given aid to escape the Nazis in Belgium, who went to America and then dealt for 20 years with Khomeini's Iran, only for people to give dinners for him in St Moritz.... if that's capitalism I don't want any part of it!

By the way, I threw him out of Gstaad. I saw him walking by my communal garage and I said to him "You belong in jail. Don't ever come by here again – go through the servants' quarters!"

Capitalism should be about creating jobs, knowing your workers and not buying and selling shares like the money shufflers.

It is presumably your views on capitalism and foreign policy that make you amenable to the likes of Norman Mailer and Joseph Heller. I liked the quote from Joseph Heller's widow that he had liked you because you hated everybody!

She told me "You don't know how much my husband liked you because you hated everybody!" I had said some pretty rude things about Joseph Heller too, but I was very pleased. I am a good friend of Norman Mailer's, because he calls himself a

Taki Theodoracopulos

Born 1936

Education: Lawrenceville School and University of Virginia

Taki is a former captain of the Greek karate team, and is a keen sailor and skier.

Arrested in 1984 for cocaine possession, and served three months in Pentonville Prison

Married, two children

Campaigned to free General Pinochet, backer of Neil Hamilton and others

Founded the *American Conservative* in 2002, in association with Pat Buchanan and Scott McConnell

Publications and articles

With Jeffrey Bernard, *High Life, Low Life*, introduction by Richard West, edited by Cosmo Landesman, 1981

Princes, Playboys & High-Class Tarts, foreword by Tom Wolfe, 1984.


High Life, selected by Andrew Cameron, 1989.

Nothing to Declare: Prison Memoirs, 1992

'High Life' columnist for *Spectator*

'Opinion' columnist for *Right Now*

Articles in *National Review*, the *London Sunday Times*, *Esquire*, *Vanity Fair*, the *New York Press*, *Quest Magazine*, and many others



conservative radical. He's a wonderful man who hits people he doesn't like – he's the writer as gorilla! He is the proper Hemingway type.

Another one of your leitmotifs is "garbage culture". How do you define garbage culture?

The best examples are rap music and any kind of hip-hop. It's total degradation of the language, especially among American blacks who refuse to speak proper English. And what is even worse is that they attack blacks who want to better themselves; they're called 'Uncle Toms' and 'white niggers'. The black actor Bill Cosby said "Don't play basketball; try to get a good education", and he was pilloried for it by everyone. But less than 1% of 1% who play basketball will make it. Every one of them thinks they will have a hundred million dollars and white chicks and big cars!

Lyndon Johnson ruined black society, by encouraging them to get more welfare by having more children. This battle was lost forever in the mid-sixties. He was the worst man in the world, a total crook, who lied to decent blacks – and even to get his Bronze Star; he never got within a thousand miles of a war zone. People say he made "a great society", but all he did was ruin generations of black Americans.

But there are other kinds of garbage culture too – such as modern American humour – programmes like *Friends* and *Cheers*. In America, they don't now like the humour we like in Europe – which is a pie-in-the-face, Groucho Marx sense of humour. Laurel and Hardy, Abbott and Costello, and the Marx brothers were the best. But then look who wrote their material – people like F Scott Fitzgerald wrote their scripts for them but refused to put their names under it. "Call me a cab" "Okay, you're a cab!" Now it's gone silly. On late night talk shows in America, everybody roars with laughter and I don't understand any of it!

Are you sometimes concerned that by talking about your exploits in print, you might be encouraging other people?

It never entered my mind. But now that you have pointed it out, probably! But I think drinking has done less harm than drugs. People are not killed to buy a bottle of whiskey, whereas a drug addict may kill. I come from a generation that is very proud to be able to drink and still perform, either in the sack or on the athletic field the next day. It is these hairy-chest Hemingway-esque examples that stay with me. I'm not going to change now! I agree it might give a bad example but there are much worse examples every day on television.

Cameron should have said 'Yes' about the drugs. I would have said "It's none of your bloody business but I took a sniff or two. It was quite good but I wouldn't do it any more". The journalists would start screaming bloody murder, but ordinary people would like it.

It was so appalling what they did to poor Kate Moss. The idea that a model cannot take drugs! She came to my house once and she was putting out her cigarette on the floor. My wife said, "Do you mind using the ashtray?" She was 16 at the time, and didn't know that she had to use an ashtray! She'd only been to hotel rooms with rock stars where they trashed rooms. She was so sweet. I think she's a delightful girl. People should leave her alone, and if she wants to put it up her nose it's her business. She's not a priest,

nor Heidi! The high-priestess Pythia of course, used to take drugs; that's how she got so dizzy.

Who do you think is working against 'garbage culture' most effectively? You're a friend of Tom Wolfe's, for instance.

Tom pointed it out in *I am Charlotte Simmons* but I don't think anyone is doing anything about it. I'm very happy when I see a nice documentary on British television, or even sometimes on public television in America, or Mastermind and programmes like that – but it's a losing battle. Look how many people buy three million copies of trash magazines like *Hello!* or the publications of this guy Richard Desmond, who's a disgusting human being. And how many buy *Right Now?* Let's face it. We're a diminishing breed. When I was young, the Rightwing was very small; everyone jumped on the Left bandwagon. That's still the case; we're always in a tiny minority. I'm rather proud of that. It's nice to be in a minority with a small band of brothers.

What are your favourite books and films?

I have to go with *Tender is the Night*, *The Great Gatsby*, *The Sun Also Rises*, *Farewell to Arms*, and *A Moveable Feast*.

The greatest film of all time was 1937's *La Grande Illusion*, starring Eric von Stroheim as Captain von Rauffenstein, a German officer and an aristocrat who is in charge of a prisoner of war camp. He finds he has more in common with one of his captives, a French aristocrat played by Pierre Fresnay, than with his fellow Germans. The film was so wonderful because it showed what we've been talking about – a small band of the aristocracy – and he knew it was going to be over after the war. He has to kill him at the end, because he has to do his duty as the French officer escapes. It was the most wonderfully moving thing because it showed that Jean Renoir – who directed it – knew that a way of life and a certain class of people was finished. He knew that the coming Second World War would finish off that way of life – which it did. Another favourite film of mine was also directed by Renoir. *La Règle du Jeu* is how you have to do certain things. There is a certain responsibility with privilege; it's a house party and everybody pays a price.

I like to see atmosphere in films – nice double-breasted suits, smoky cafés, railway stations, and officers with wonderful uniforms. That's the kind of dream world I grew up with and that I would like to see preserved. □

Notes

1. *Winston's Folly*, by Christopher Catherwood (Constable & Robinson, 2004) examined critically the part played by Winston Churchill when he was Colonial Secretary in the 1920s, and the effects on the modern Middle East.
2. Former US Deputy Secretary of Defense Paul Wolfowitz is now President of the World Bank.
3. The America Israel Public Affairs Committee is a pro-Israel political lobbying group in the United States.
4. Eminent American conservative and founder of the *National Review*.
5. An interview with *Chronicles* editor Thomas Fleming appeared in *RN* 54.
6. The EU's chief accountant, Martha Andreasen, was suspended in 2002 after revealing evidence of chronic accounting flaws in EU accounts.
7. Marc Rich was evacuated from Antwerp to the US in 1942, where he became a billionaire commodities trader and major donor to Bill Clinton's Democratic Party. In 1983, he was accused of tax evasion and making illegal oil deals with Iran at the time of the US hostage crisis, and fled to Switzerland. He received a controversial presidential pardon from Bill Clinton in the closing hours of Clinton's presidency. He subsequently initiated lucrative business dealings with Saddam Hussein, and now lives in Switzerland.

SPREAD THE WORD...

Why not buy *Right Now!* in bulk, to sell to friends and colleagues? This not only helps us to spread our message and increase our influence, but will also allow you to make a small profit on each magazine you sell. 'Enlightened self-interest' in action!

10 copies: £25.00 (cover price £29.50)


20 copies £50.50 (cover price £59)

30 copies £75.00 (cover price £88.50)

More than 30 copies – please contact us.

Cheques/postal orders/card details should be made payable to 'Right Now' and sent to:

Right Now! Box 361, 78 Marylebone High Street, London W1U 5AP.



The limitations and implications of economics


Derek Turner interviews eminent economist and *Right Now* patron, **Ezra Mishan**

Please tell us about your early years.

My father, who was a textile importer, and mother came from Cairo to this country in about 1915. They were from a Jewish background but they weren't very religious and I wasn't very religious particularly. I was born in 1917. I went to Manchester Grammar School, but left at the age of 15 and went to Central America to learn the family business. My father exported textiles to my Uncle Sam, who lived there. I learned the business and the language, and spent the years until 1937 going to various parts of Central America.

My father had opened a textile mill by then in Guatemala with his brother, so I went to learn textile technology at Salford Tech. I did two years and got a City & Guilds qualification. When the war broke out, I joined the RAF. Because of my eyesight I was demoted to ground staff. I was demobbed out in 1943.

I realised that if I went into economics I'd know a lot more about business than my father! So I went to Manchester University and took my first degree there in economics, then to the London School of Economics for two years and then to Chicago for two years, where I took my doctorate, my supervisor being Milton Friedman. I got into the London School of Economics as assistant lecturer in 1956. I gradually moved up the ladder to become professor in 1974, but resigned my chair in 1977 to take up a position



Professor Ezra Mishan

in a number of American universities until 1983 when I had to retire – although I felt sure I could have continued teaching for another 20 years.

A belief in economic growth often goes hand in hand with 'progress'. What first made you doubt these parallel myths?

I remember standing on a bridge over a busy road in Chicago. I said to my fiancée, "Look at all these cars. Three lanes are going south, three lanes are going north and if you live in the south you go north and vice versa. Look at all the waste!"

In 1959, the editors of the two premier

economic journals in Britain and America arranged for 12 surveys to be written on selected aspects of economics.

I was elected to write the one on welfare economics, which deals with the allocation of scarce resources so as to advance the general welfare. It turned out to be quite a success and was translated into many languages, including Japanese. Yet I ended the survey expressing misgivings about any theoretical progress in the subject having any guidance to offer in promoting welfare, at least in the West. The more I thought about the matter, the more I began to suspect that continued economic growth in the West was, on balance, more likely to diminish than to enhance the welfare of society.

During seminars organised to discuss the issues I raised, my views were not well received. Nearly all my colleagues virtually pounced on me, occasionally suggesting that I was romanticising about some golden age that had never existed, but it was nothing like that. I thought more and more about it and wrote other articles on the theme, and finally, in 1965, my book *The Costs of Economic Growth*. One publisher after another dismissed it and called me a dreamer, so I pushed it into a drawer and forgot about it.

In 1966, a young man, Lionel Needleman, joined the economics staff at LSE and during a conversation I mentioned my ill-fated book. He said he knew of a publisher who would publish anything. I sent the MS to him, but even he was lukewarm, and in reply sent two pages of cynical comments by his reader. I promptly 'phoned his secretary and said I would withdraw it unless he accepted it exactly as written. To my surprise, he agreed.

It turned out to be a tremendous success, and received 'rave reviews' even from academic economists. That was the beginning of my 'fame' or notoriety. I received invitations to lunch or dine with a number of well-known editors and other important people, offers to give public lectures at which I enjoyed red-carpet treatment. In 1971, while in Washington DC, I was interviewed by a couple of reporters from the *New York Times* which took up the whole of their Sunday magazine supplement. I was represented as a creative economic theorist, though an eccentric one – really telling us that economic growth was bad for us. (Incidentally, Penguin bought the paperback rights, sold 50,000 copies, and then bid for my *21 Popular Economic Fallacies*. I was proud to have it reviewed by the late Enoch Powell, who recommended the book to his fellow MPs.)

Eminent though you are, you are in a small minority amongst economists and educated opinion in general. Why do people go along with the idea of endless economic growth?

Other economists were too busy keeping up with the growth of the economic literature or seeking to advance their prospects – although, later on, about the 1970s – journals and books on environmental economics began to appear.

Then, many economists and business leaders were persuaded by a famous article written by Ronald Coase published in the *Journal of Law and Economics* in 1960. There he argued that, given a proper system of property rights in all resources, a competitive economy would of itself bring about an ideal allocation of goods and resources without any intervention of governments. In other words, we didn't have to worry any more about the spillover effects of industry or any economic activity: just leave it to the market!

Obviously such a theorem became very popular among Chicago School economists and business leaders, and was often quoted at conferences – even though, in an article published in 1967, I pointed out that the theorem was valid only in very restricted circumstances. For all significant spillovers it was useless. (I also wrote a satire on it, "Pangloss on Pollution", in the *Swedish Economic Journal*, 1971.)

There was a recent television series on economic growth and happiness. Among others they also consulted Lord (Richard) Layard, who was one of my graduate students in the Sixties. He gave reasons why greater material growth may not be expected to increase happiness – all of which reasons can be found in my *Costs of Economic Growth* – although it is immodest in me to say so. [Editor's Note: Lord Layard is founder-director of the LSE Centre for Economic Performance.]

Isn't cost-benefit analysis a fairly crude tool?

CBA is not crude, but it's extremely slippery. Perhaps that's why I was attracted to it.

My book *Cost-Benefit Analysis* (1971) was the first book that ever came out on the subject. I've just finished the fifth edition.

You can get pretty far with CBA in the absence of uncertainty about the future. Uncertainty implies that you don't even know the probabilities of the future movements of prices and other variables. It has become an increasingly popular technique, but the question of the wellbeing of individuals, whether they will get greater enjoyment of life or not, doesn't come within its ambit.

You have been accused of being anti-science and anti-technology, because you believe that scientific research is limited in its usefulness and has unquantifiable implications. Can you clarify your views?

I'm neither anti-science nor anti-technology, but I do recognise their limitations. For example, the computer and the Internet have had all kinds of consequences which I would rather do without. Terrorists, sex offenders and paedophiles can all communicate more easily, and it has been used to penetrate military secrets. You could possibly even use the internet to shut down whole industries. I even wish we hadn't invented the automobile and air travel. Has technology made us feel better on the whole – has it made us a closer knit community? It hasn't worked that way.

I just point these things out; I can't give any solutions to the problems. In fact, I don't think there is any way of stopping it. The culmination of all this is that we are on a path of self-destruction. So much money is poured into research; so many people depend upon it. It has enormous corrupting power.

There seems to have been a move away from market fundamentalism in recent years. David Cameron, for instance, now talks about well-being being more important than GNP. Is this just election-eering or a genuine change of heart?

I don't think it will go very far. Milton Friedman recommends competitive capitalism as the solution and I can understand that point of view. If you had to choose between central direction of resources or the market I would always prefer the market for the reasons he gives – most importantly, the dissemination of power rather than having it concentrated in one place.

I don't think there is much else you can do about economic growth except to be aware of it. The power wielded today by conglomerates and monopolies is extraordinary. I can't see how you can counter that unless you give more power to the state. We've got the Mergers and Monopolies Commission which occasionally acts, but when we are talking of globalisation we are also talking of gigantic trans-planetary business concerns wielding great social and political power. I don't think there is much hope of persuading them to expand more slowly, or to think of the effects on people's welfare.

Certainly not when the mainstream political Left has bought into market reductionism as well. People seem to depend more on the moral influence of non-governmental organisations than on the government – to hope groups like Greenpeace might make an impact in time.

They do indeed make an impact, if only on the media. But I don't think it is critical. I am very pessimistic about the influence they can exert on governments. Think of all the scientists engaged in research, practical research into innovations that will change our way of life. There's no stopping it.

Is nobody in British politics on the right track?

I can't think of anyone, but even if they were on the right track they couldn't do much about it. Cameron is not a bad lad. He will probably talk his way to Prime Minister but he hasn't got a lot to offer. I don't think any one has. You'd have to have supreme power, and not only over Britain. We in this country may all become conservationists, but we won't be able to persuade the Chinese government to slow its rate of development and think primarily about the growing pollution of its cities and its rivers. And then there's Brazil where they're still battling on against the odds to save what's left of the Amazon forest.

I am a great admirer of determined environmental groups like Greenpeace, but their occasional successes can only delay environmental degradation of the planet.

What do you think are the current forces driving immigration policy in the West? Is the present open-door policy driven solely by economics?

I can only guess. What strikes me most is that governments in the West seem to be so ignorant of basic economics.

Soon after the last World War, the media kept on about a general shortage of labour in Britain – a popular fallacy if there ever was one. What was in fact happening at the time was incipient inflation.

"Cameron is not a bad lad. He will probably talk his way to Prime Minister but he hasn't got a lot to offer"

And that could only be aggravated by immigration. Soon we became worried about labour shortages in particular sectors of the economy, chiefly in transport and nursing. So, during the 1950s, Caribbean families were being encouraged to migrate into Britain in large numbers.

But the vacancies in question were spurious: for a rise in pay (and improvement in working conditions) would have attracted the necessary numbers – which would mean a distribution of real income to workers in these occupations from the rest of the working population.

Not only is there no economic justification for the continuing flow of immigrants to our shores, but their presence here has created resentment among the indigenous population. Unavoidably they give rise to social problems, sometimes racial conflicts, that continue to place a burden on the police and strain our political ingenuity and our resources.

Yet among the members of the establishment and among academics, the tendency was to flaunt their enlightened credentials by welcoming the mass of coloured immigrants as a valuable contribution to our economy and our society. You could say that it was not so much woeful ignorance as determined ignorance, as purposeful ignorance. Academics and politicians just didn't want to know: in any case Britain had a long tradition of supporting the free movement of goods and people.

I recall that when Needleman and I were invited to speak at an economics seminar at LSE about our recent article in one of the economic journals, one containing estimates of the excess aggregate demand for domestic goods and imports arising from mass immigration, we came under relentless attack. It felt like being the accused at a Moscow state trial. Yet our colleagues must have known that even quite elementary economics would show that the import of labour must add to aggregate demand and act to lower real wages.

I recently heard Frances Cairncross, a contributor to the *Economist*, speaking on the radio about the pensioner problem. According to Miss Cairncross, since the ratio of workers to pensioners was declining, owing to the decline in the indigenous birth rate, the required ratio could be restored by immigrant workers. Moreover, we may not have to continue this immigration indefinitely as the immi-

grants could be expected to have larger families. I have to admit I almost exploded while listening to her. Of all the conceivable ways of tackling the pension problem, this was, far and away, the daftest criminal lunacy.

The obvious and simple way to maintain standards for pensioners is to have workers save and invest more from their incomes – though not much more if workers agree to retire later in life than 65 or so.

What are the chief diseconomies of mass immigration?

The main disadvantage is that it acts over time to lower real income. The more capital to labour the higher living standards are.

There is also a strong relationship, especially in this country, between total income and total imports; the more people come in, the more goods we import. Thus mass immigration acts to turn the terms of trade against us. And this takes the form of a rise in the costs of imported goods and materials, so reducing average real income. What is more, if the rise in the costs of goods is significant, it is almost certain to lead to claims for higher wages and, possibly, a wage-price spiral.

Of course, life would be easier if all of us resigned ourselves to the unavoidable fluctuations in the costs of imports – that is, without making wage claims whenever the costs moved against us. But given what Daniel Bell called "the revolution of rising expectations", characteristic of Western societies today, we can be sure that wage claims will continue over the foreseeable future whatever the pretexts.

The third element is the limited supply of land, especially important in a relatively small country like ours. Over the inter-war period about four million new houses were built in Britain. Today, chiefly because of the increase in our population, arising from the growth of immigrant families that have settled here since the war, we are planning ever more housing developments, particularly around London and the South East. But, of course, as land – building land – becomes scarcer, its price continues to rise and so therefore do house prices. This increases the cost of living and so acts to lower real incomes in the country.

What are the chief effects of the global population growth we have seen in recent decades?

If I recall correctly, in the mid 1940s, world population was estimated to be about 2.5 billion. Today, it is between 7 and 8 billion, the greater part in Asia, Africa, and South America. The ecological effects on the planet are profound. And in many areas the pressure of populations is causing deforestation, desertification: it can also lead to conflict over scarce resources and limited fresh water supplies.

The Chinese government is conscious of population growth and is trying to prevent it in its own country. But there is no attempt to control population growth in Africa, South America, or other parts of Asia. In general, the white population on this earth is gradually declining.

Life on this earth would be a lot easier and more comfortable if the population were only a fraction of what it is. An ideal population for Britain

Professor Ezra J. Mishan

Born: 1917, Manchester; married 1951, four children.

Education: Manchester Grammar School, Salford Technical College, Manchester University, London School of Economics, University of Chicago.

Publications include: *The Costs of Economic Growth*, 1967; *Welfare Economics: An Assessment*, 1969; *Welfare Economics, Ten Introductory Essays*, 1969; *Economic Growth: The Price We Pay*, 1969; *21 Popular Economic Fallacies*, 1969; *Cost-Benefit Analysis*, 1971; *Making the World Safe for Pornography & Other Intellectual Fashions*, 1973; *The Economic Growth Debate: An Assessment*, 1977; *An Introduction to Normative Economics*, 1980; *Pornography, Psychedelics, and Technology: Limits to Freedom*, 1981; *What Political Economy is All About*, 1981; *Economic Efficiency and Social Welfare*, 1981; *Economic Myths and the Mythology of Economics*, 1986; *Eleven Popular Fallacies of the Liberal Enlightenment*, 1995.

Plus over 80 articles in the foremost economic journals and about as many again on controversial social topics in *Encounter*, *Political Quarterly*, *Salisbury Review*, *Contemporary Review*, *Right Now* and others.

would be between 10 and 15 million, what it was about the end of the 18th Century.

Thinking of population controls, I'm not anti-contraceptive. But allowing schoolgirls access to the pill or giving out condoms to schoolchildren can only make them feel that if they are not having regular sexual activity they are not behaving normally. However, I am anti-abortion. As a means for reducing population growth, it is immoral. Once you have created a potential human life, an embryo, you have a moral responsibility toward it.

What can be done to spread the gospel of sustainable economics?

I have never offered a solution. All over the world people are now fixated on economic growth. But we should be able, in this country, to make modern less abrasive for sensitive people. In my *Costs of Economic Growth* I put forward the idea of setting aside large 'amenity areas' for those who wanted to opt out of certain wearisome aspects of modern life – areas over which aircraft would not be allowed to venture, where there was no motorised traffic (only electric-powered public transport), no motorised garden implements, no loud stereophonics and so on. Such areas would differ in size, location and composition of amenities offered. But they would require legislation. Yet immersed as we are in a seeming struggle to "maintain our competitive edge" and somehow to "keep our position in the growth league tables", such opportunities of creating for ourselves, or at least for some of us, a more leisurely, quieter way of life – technically quite possible – are dismissed as the stuff of dreams.

In the meantime, I cannot escape the feeling that some great catastrophe is drawing nearer. Among the growing dangers, one must include the massive growth of cities of over 15 or 20 million in Asia or Latin America, many surrounded by shanty towns filled with desperate families. A failure in the electricity or water supply, a severe drought or flood, over a few days, could easily precipitate uncontrollable rioting as angry hordes of people invade the city centres and create havoc.

Your worldview encompasses ethical as well as economical considerations. Do you have any religious faith?

I would rather have a world in which every one believed in God. Religion can be an immense source of comfort and solace to people. Of course, it cannot be doubted that religion has lent itself to all sorts of abuses. But then any institution disposing of enormous power is bound to lend itself to corruption. Yet, at least among the countries of the West, religion has been fading from our lives. It is no longer a real force in our lives. Lost innocence cannot be restored. Once we are aware that over hundreds of millions of years creatures, large and small, have evolved that survive only by preying on each other, either as parasites or tearing and clawing others to death to devour them, it is hardly possible to believe in God. It may be possible to believe in some omnipotent source of power, but certainly not a caring or benevolent one.

What is your guiding philosophy?

My guiding philosophy is simply to resign myself to the inevitable: to "eat, drink, and be merry," for tomorrow I will cease to be. □

Dr Frank Ellis: A personal statement on the occasion of my leaving the University of Leeds on 30th June 2006

"But another voice inside me called out: Someone has to stand up"

Harry Wu

At 1400 hrs on Thursday 23rd March 2006 I was suspended by the University of Leeds. I was suspended because I had attacked, among other things, but primarily, the cult of multiculturalism. I was not attacked and demands were not made that I be dismissed because I was wrong. No, I was closer to the truth than my attackers – they knew it – and that is why they sought my removal from the university. I stand by everything I have said and written.

Unable and unwilling to address the substance of my criticism of multiculturalism, the university resorted to bureaucratic and administrative counter-measures. My suspension was intended to be a grand gesture that would propitiate a mob on and off campus and, of course, the Commission for Racial Equality. Having suspended me, the university then realised that it faced formidable legal, intellectual and moral challenges. A very large number of academics and scientists, as well as representatives from a number of NGOs, had informed the university and me that they would appear as witnesses for the defence in any hearing.

In February 2005, members of the School of Modern Languages and Cultures (SMLC) were briefed about the dire financial state of the school's budget for the academic years 2005-2006 and 2006-2007. In order to ease the budgetary deficit, the SMLC asked for five volunteers to consider taking early retirement. By this time, bitterly disillusioned with the relentless bureaucratisation and *Gleichschaltung* of university life, which started to get much worse in the SMLC from September 2004, and the equally relentless spoon-feeding of too many lazy students, I decided enough was enough. I volunteered for early retirement. To my astonishment, my application was denied. It was denied because of my research profile, which the SMLC wanted, quite properly, to exploit in the forthcoming Research Assessment Exercise (RAE 2007). One year later, the university was rather pleased to be able to revisit this option.

In suspending me and attempting to make a case against me, the university has done serious damage to academic freedom (free speech) in this country. Who now in a British university, having seen what happened to me, will dare to attack feminism, multiculturalism and issues arising from race? There will be some, possibly many, in British universities who will rejoice that the university behaved in the way it did. These are the people who would have burnt Galileo at the stake. In the 19th Century, they exiled writers in Tsarist Russia. If they had been able, they would have cast Darwin into jail or stoned him to death. In Nazi Germany, they applauded Martin Heidegger's infamous *Rektoratsrede* and lecherous virtue was smeared all over their ugly, vile faces as they squealed with joy, gloating, as the books burned on 10th May 1933. During Stalin's purges and Mao's Cultural Revolution these disgusting cowards raised their hands to approve the most savage measures against any form of dissent, real or imagined. Such are the people who control British universities today.

Finally, I must thank the following: the students at Leeds, past and present, and the other universities, who supported me; academics in England and abroad who supported me; the Aussie feminist academic who denounced me as "fascist" and then apologised and offered me her support (good on you, mate); my magnificent legal team (awesome chaps); the editor and readers of *Right Now*; the Conservative MPs who, given my attacks on their party, would have been justified in leaving me to it; the indefatigable and ferociously incisive scourge of liberal bigots, Mr Robert Henderson; and the editor and readers of *American Renaissance* and the many people in Leeds who wrote to me, wishing me the best.

God bless you all

Frank Ellis,
14th July 2006

© Frank Ellis 2006 All Rights Reserved

Dancing with death

Roger Kershaw suspects that Hirsi Ali has more than one mortal adversary

The Dutch state and society seem to be subject to journalistic stereotyping and condescension rather more than most, perhaps because only in a crisis do the Netherlands rank as visit-worthy for British column-writers, and then only on a strictly fleeting basis.

Not that I disagreed with the general thrust of Rod Liddle's write-up, three months after the ritual murder of film-maker Theo van Gogh in Amsterdam.¹ In the absence of the previously assassinated taboo-breaker, anti-immigration campaigner Pim Fortuyn, and the disintegration of his party, it was not totally implausible that the Dutch political elite would 'default' to the corrosive permissiveness, complacent multiculturalism and homage to Brussels with which the country had lately been identified, once the breast-beating was done. Nonetheless, the impact of Fortuyn was enduring for the time being, in the form of two conservative cabinets, 'Balkenende I' (July–October 2002) and 'Balkenende II', (May 2003–June 2006), Fortuyn's Lijst Pim Fortuyn being a member of the first. If Islamists associate immigration controls with pressure for assimilation and conformity to human rights by those already securely resident, van Gogh's and Ayaan Hirsi Ali's campaigning on behalf of Muslim women was taking place in a context which butcher Bouyeri and his cell, the Hofstad Groep, will already have seen as threatening both for their faith and their females.²

At the same time, van Gogh and his collaborator were not alone in their efforts. There was already a dedicated, if unstructured, band of social workers, journalists and police agitated about the phenomenon of *eerwraak* ('honour-killing') among Muslim immigrants. The issue was also on the radar of the Balkenende cabinets.³ On this subject specifically, is it possible that Liddle overlooked some important material in the language which he conveniently concluded had been superseded by English as "the language of Holland's capital city" (which ever one he meant by that)? While I would be the first to acknowledge that one significant piece of prescriptive research on the "administration of integration", commissioned by the Lower House of the States General, was neither radically assimilationist nor seriously pessimistic about the feasibility of integration, it does in its 48-page section on the emancipation of women and girls mention domestic violence and female genital mutilation as obstacles to be overcome; arranged marriage, female circumcision, honour-killing, and education in sex and relationships as subjects which immigrant women (especially Moroccans) should be encouraged to discuss among themselves.⁴

Besides, it does not require access to such materials to have noticed that "our brave boys from the Met" did not start to look with a culturally suspicious (or politically incorrect) eye on the numerous disappearances, etc, of young Asian women in Britain

until after a European seminar hosted by their Dutch colleagues, in The Hague in June 2004.⁵


The pathos of Hirsi Ali

By sheer emphasis the name of Ayaan Hirsi Ali is associated more with the analytical ridicule of multiculturalism than with opposition to immigration. She was more a 'cultural' than 'political' refugee from Somalia, where her father had set up a forced marriage for her in Canada. She believes immigration into Europe should be reserved for those who come in a spirit of embracing the values of human freedom and rule of law. This of course excludes the oppression of women, of which she has the most poignant, personal experience, and which above all motivated her to become Theo van Gogh's script-writer for his film *Submission*. But the separation of church and state is a key condition for almost all the other values to flourish. Hirsi's supreme 'moment of truth' regarding the poisonous use of Islamic religion to serve ambition and power – whether by states, non-state actors, or patriarchal males *vis-à-vis* wives and daughters – came with the destruction of the World Trade Center in September 2001. Being by then a graduate in the Netherlands, she joined Parliament by standing for VVD. (This involved, significantly, breaking with the Labour Party, with which she had a research job.) Being an MP afforded an enhanced status for pursuit of her mission to educate not only the Dutch but all humanity in the menace of Islam. If Europeans in particular are complacent, they must learn that as they are neither isolated nor immune, awareness and preparedness are a matter of self-protection.⁶

At the butchering of van Gogh, a note was pinned to his corpse identifying Hirsi as the next target. Thus her existing police protection was augmented to 24-hour bodyguard level. But by 2006 the police presence was felt 'oppressive' by certain neighbours, who applied to a court for Hirsi's removal from her flat in the name of their human rights. The Ministry of Justice gave notice of appeal, but this was overtaken by a TV exposé of falsehood in Hirsi's original asylum application, which led the Minister of Alien Affairs and Integration, Rita Verdonk (also VVD), to tell Parliament that Hirsi could not be considered to be a Dutch citizen. Hirsi resigned her seat, and announced that she would move to the American Enterprise Institute in Washington. A notion of 'pathos' scarcely does justice to the fact that the tightening of asylum laws (passed in February 2004) and steps to denaturalise and deport dual nationals convicted of crimes (initiated immediately after van Gogh's murder) netted van Gogh's own collaborator – one of the bravest fighters for liberty in the world today – almost with an appearance of priority.⁷

A provisional judgement on the event, together with the tangible, self-censoring 'delicacy' of the Dutch media since van Gogh, might see a notable victory for Islamism, as historic perhaps as the election defeat of the Aznar government after Madrid. But then came an almost more bizarre turn of events. Parliamentary execration of Verdonk led to a 'technicality' being discovered whereby Hirsi's passport could be restored six weeks later. But D66 found the manner of this restoration so insultingly grudging that it moved a motion of no confidence in the minister and withdrew from the cabinet, precipitating its fall on 29 June. However, the CDA and VVD are managing to carry on as a rump, with parliamentary support from LPF, until new elections in November.

Hirsi Ali



Hard choices for the Partij van de Arbeid?

Mevrouw Verdonk's stand on immigration-control has gone with a robust position on integration. While there is a logical distinction between these two approaches, the two can of course be practised side by side – albeit, ideally, integration should be made a condition for permission to stay. However, there is a crucial difference between (a) demanding assimilation in the interests of the country's stability; and (b) extending human rights protection, in his or her interest, to someone who is already well integrated. Option (a), in an inevitably voluntarist form, will complement repatriation as a 'second best' where the mal-integrated have already secured their citizenship or right of abode. But one can conceive that certain politicians and voters of the Right may not particularly favour (b) at all, not least where the price of extending protection to someone like Hirsi Ali is precisely that Islamists are provoked to plan further attacks. No doubt the attitude of some of Hirsi's 'war-weary' neighbours was 'a plague on both your houses'!

But what of the Left? Can one rely on the Left-liberal conscience, a driving force behind European asylum, to defend its 'clients' when some form of 'Third World oppression' pursues them within their country of adoption? Or will the outspoken individual refugee be sacrificed to the imperative of placating group-leaders who purport to speak for a section of immigrants – and can deliver their votes in urban elections? Will the human rights of terrorists take priority over the rights of these 'inconvenient' critics of Islam and multiculturalism, especially renegades from the Leftwing *laager*?

The situation of the Dutch Labour Party was fraught post-Pim Fortuyn, with the dramatic erosion of its vote in the May 2002 elections and demise of Wim Kok's cabinet. Given that PvdA had attracted (deservedly) a large part of the odium for the flood of immigration and its consequences, there was little prospect of an early return to government, at least without a pragmatic reassessment of its positions. A debate on multiculturalism had already broken out within the party, but as we have seen, Hirsi Ali had found the ideology still sufficiently entrenched in 2002 for her to find more resonance in the Rightwing VVD. To abandon the party's ingrained conviction that a concentrated and autonomous Muslim presence was entirely consistent with the existing model of Dutch pluralism – indeed that the viability of multiculturalism in the Netherlands was guaranteed by that historic model⁸ – would be seen as a betrayal of principle by Left-wing intelligentsia. Certainly an ideological wrench is entailed for post-modern thought, wherein ethnic minorities have



Theo van Gogh

The killer of Theo van Gogh, Mohammed Bouyeri

His 'open letter' to Hirsi Ali, a long, rambling death threat, included the following –

"AYAAN HIRSI ALI YOU SHALL BREAK YOURSELF TO PIECES ON ISLAM !

Islam will conquer by the blood of the martyrs. It will spread its light to every corner of this Earth and it will, if necessary, drive evil to its dark hole by the sword.

This unleashed battle is different from previous battles. The unbelieving fundamentalists have started it and Insha Allah the true believers will end it.

There shall be no mercy for the unjust, only the sword raised at them. No discussion, no demonstrations, no parades, no petitions; merely DEATH..."



rather taken the place of the working-class as the world's 'primary oppressed'. The issue of multiculturalism was already emotive enough in May 2002 for Fortuyn's assassin to claim that he had acted "on behalf of minorities", and for a founder of LPF to say that "the bullet came from the Left".⁹ When the minister pronounced Hirsi's citizenship invalid in May 2006, PvdA supported the motion for an emergency debate, but its comments tended to focus on the hypocrisy of VVD for only now taking action on flaws which it had known about before – yet under an

Continued overleaf

NOTES

- 1 Rod Liddle, 'No tolerance, please, we're Dutch', *Spectator*, 5 February 2005.
- 2 On Pim Fortuyn's ideas and meteoric rise, see John Peet, 'Political games', in 'A Survey of the Netherlands', *Economist*, 4 May 2002; Joop J M Holsteyn, Galen A Irwin, 'Never a dull moment: Pim Fortuyn and the Dutch parliamentary election of 2002', *West European Politics* 26, No. 2 (April 2003): pp 41-66. Especially germane on his position that Islam is incompatible with post-Enlightenment modernity was the interview with Belinda Rhodes on BBC World Service, 'Analysis', 30 April 2002 – as excerpted posthumously on BBC Radio 4, 'Broadcasting House', 12 May 2002. As a professor of sociology, Fortuyn was also strong on 'critical mass' – the virtual impossibility of assimilating physically concentrated immigrant groups. Apart from attracting voters by articulating what people had been feeling for a long time, Fortuyn also tapped a general ennui with the immobile, so-called 'Purple Coalition' of Partij van de Arbeid (PvdA – the Labour Party), Volkspartij voor Vrijheid en Democratie (VVD – secular Right-wing), and Democraten 66 (D66 – Left-of-centre progressive), under Minister-President Wim Kok (PvdA). The dominant partners in the first Balkenende cabinet were Christen-Democratisch Appèl (CDA – Christian Democrat) and VVD.
- 3 The subject was featured on several Dutch web-sites by mid-2004; even if one or two attempted to explain honour-killing in a more culturally 'understanding' spirit, this was manifestly in response to growing awareness and outrage in other circles.
- 4 Tweede Kamer, Tijdelijke Commissie Onderzoek Integratiebeleid, *Bruggen Bouwen: Eindrapport*. 's – Gravenhage, Sdu Uitgevers, 2004 [January]: pp 451; 453.
- 5 BBC reporting on 22 June suggested a Dutch initiative. However, I note that Scotland Yard itself took the entire credit: see 'Most 'honour crimes' hidden by fear', *Guardian*, 23 June 2004. So did they, like me, see the 'flashing light' regarding Pakistan's European beach-head, in reports such as 'More than 600 women murdered in Pakistan 'honour-killings'', *Scotsman*, 16 September 2003? It particularly needs to be grasped that it is by no means only the more 'cultural' asset of family honour that is at stake but the very faith of a young female who takes up with a European boyfriend. Even the conversion of an in-marrying European male does not obviate the risk – indeed fact – in strict Muslim perception, of the 'apostasy' of the female, for which the whole of her family will burn in Hell for not having prevented.
- 6 That is, not merely aware of the 'fundamentalism' which others love to identify as a man-made deviation, in comforting contradistinction from the 'true religion'. Hirsi stresses Islam's requirement of unthinking submission (hence the film title). Among several notable interviews in the British media I would especially cite Alexander Linklater, 'Danger woman', *Guardian* (G2), 17 May 2005.
- 7 Deprived of state protection, "her life in the Netherlands could have become very dangerous indeed": see 'Heading for the land of the free', *Economist*, 20 May 2006. It is predictable that many more 'ideal immigrants' will suffer from the strict application of laws as European governments attempt to measure up to terrorism: Christopher Caldwell, 'Hirsi Ali's case is only the start', *Financial Times*, 20/21 May 2006.
- 8 Omitted here is the history of PvdA within the Netherlands' unique system of accommodative politics. For an overview by the most influential sociologist of 'consociationalism', see Arend Lijphart, *Verzuiling, pacificatie en kentering in de Nederlandse politiek*. Amsterdam, de Bussy, 1968. Each confessional or ethical 'pillar' had its own broadcasting station.
- 9 Quoted in 'Never a dull moment'. See Note 2.

asylum policy which it would never have had anyway if it had heeded the PvdA!¹⁰

Labour also faces the practical requirement of appealing to the Muslims in the inner city areas which they now dominate. Taking the side of apostate Hirsi over her virtual expulsion from the Netherlands would have gone down badly in many Muslim quarters. It is bizarre to see a once doughty fighter for a secular model now becoming the patron of a religious faith group – and not even one of Dutch provenance, or culturally compatible. Yet if the party sees a need to win back native Dutch votes by taking a tougher line on immigration, there is an arguable imperative to ‘balance’ this by a ‘non-dictatorial’ posture on Muslim culture. It may make sense that none other than the traditionally Labour-linked station, VARA was the one which produced the bogus TV ‘exposé’ of Hirsi’s misdemeanour.¹¹

There is probably no single view of the way forward, within the PvdA. In fact, division seems confirmed by a disoriented essay from its new leader. He first insists that Muhammad Bouyeri was an agent of militant international Islamism, not a product of poor integration. Yet he does not wonder why, in the case of Islam, integration can prove so empty. He proceeds to call for more integration, but not so much in order to forestall militancy as by way of a grand strategic vision for making the Muslims more recognisably ‘Dutch’ to the natives so that the latter will consent to share state welfare with them, to the further benefit of


integration. But Bos becomes engagingly frank about the difficulties of assimilating large numbers, and calls on those who advocate continuing immigration to assist in finding solutions. If governments fail to engage with voter scepticism about multiculturalism, and there is no tangible headway on assimilation, no political movement can hope to promote the goal of welfare for all, paid for by all.¹²

Possibly so – especially if it never gets elected! But does not the Labour leader himself fall short in conceptual sophistication? The more ‘extreme’ expression of Islam (or what counts as the orthodox expression of it for Hirsi Ali) does not need to be ‘imported’. It is present, at least latently, wherever a Muslim population is implanted. The mere interaction with a *kafir* society, not least one which presumes to tell Muslims to integrate and how to integrate, can be a powerful stimulus for dissidence, with little stimulus from international Muslim communication. □

NOTES – Cont’d

- 10 Cf PvdA leader Wouter Bos, quoted in ‘Hirsi Ali vertrekt per direct uit Tweede Kamer’, *Planet* [website], 16 May 2006.
- 11 Vereniging Arbeiders Radio Amateurs. (N.B. Hirsi had not subsequently denied the flaws in her asylum application.) The party has achieved a comeback in recent local elections: ‘Left back’, *Economist*, 11 March 2006.
- 12 Wouter Bos, ‘After van Gogh’, *Prospect*, No. 106, January 2005, pp 10–11. His theory of welfare in a plural society frankly echoes David Goodhart, ‘Too diverse?’, *Prospect*, No. 95, February 2004, pp 30–37.

Roger Kershaw first visited the Netherlands in 1954. This laid the foundations of an interest in Dutch politics – as well as a curiosity about Indonesia which would lead on indirectly to a career in Southeast Asian Studies.



ON VIEW

The Road to Byzantium: Luxury Arts of Antiquity

London-based readers with an interest in art history should find this little exhibition quite fascinating. It documents the long survival of classical beliefs and imagery in the Byzantine Empire and surrounding territories where Greek and Roman culture was influential, long after the Western Roman Empire had collapsed. Such a theme is likely to appeal to those of conservative sensibility and classical tastes.

Well into the 7th Century, the applied and fine arts of Byzantium and many parts of the Near East were suffused with images and forms reminiscent of the Greek and Roman masters, and the memory of the likes of Pheidias was kept alive right up until the final defeat of the Byzantines in 1453. Items such as the 7th Century dish showing Silenus dancing with a maenad (left) demonstrate that respect for the pagan deities survived in tandem with Christianity until a very late date. Byzantine art was not all golden-haloed but rather lifeless ikons and mosaics, but also comprised naturalistic yet also idealized representations of the human form, in the best traditions of the classical canon. By contrast, in the West the classical tradition was almost entirely forgotten from the end of the Roman empire right up until Tudor times and the rise of the antiquarians.

Classicism rubbed off on Byzantium’s neighbours in Scythia on the northern coast of the Black Sea, which was settled by Greeks from the 6th Century BC – one of the stars of the show is a gold Scythian *gorytos*, or quiver, with beautifully realized Greek-style figures. Classicism also migrated all the way into Asia Minor and Egypt, until it began to be rubbed out by the (in this respect) stultifying influence of

Islam, with its taboo about portrayals of the human form. One of the most fascinating – and melancholy – pieces is a large *lanx* (tray) from 8th/ 9th Century Syria, on which the figures have become increasingly stylized, in deference to creeping Muslim distaste for images of people.

Another remarkable item is a 6th/7th Century bowl, which portrays not only the story of Hercules’ labours, but also Indian-style monkey musicians and the Hindu deity Kirtimukha – a surprisingly composite item for even this ancient collision-place of civilizations. There are also red-and-black Attic pots decorated with elegant figures going about their daily tasks or getting excited by ‘the first swallow of spring’ – a haunting, almost photographic evocation of normal people from 2,500 years ago looking just like us and doing the kinds of things we still do today. The exhibition also displays astonishingly well-preserved Coptic Christian textiles from 4th Century Egypt, which likewise combine classical pagan and Christian iconography, and realistic votive hands from both 3rd/4th Century Phrygia and 6th Century Syria, which are great-grandfathers to the tin votive offerings still made today in Catholic churches across southern Europe.

The exhibition shows that the classical tradition, which is the West’s great gift to the ages, is one that has very deep roots and wide, if not quite universal, appeal across cultures and across centuries, even millennia. By rejecting classicism, as we have done in recent decades, we are not only cutting ourselves off from our own roots, but effectively impoverishing the whole world. □



Somerset House,
until 3 September
2006
Admission £5
(£4 concessions)

A Bahraini resident looks at democracy in the Arab world

Five years after 9/11, the Middle East continues to dominate world news. There is no end in sight to the daily carnage in Iraq; the US has Iran firmly in its sights; and Palestine is ablaze.

These are only the latest in a series of misadventures spanning almost a century. The history of the Middle East is full of examples of Western interference, the legacy of which continues today. Ibn Saud was armed and backed by the British, despite stronger historic claims from the Hashemites and Al-Rasheeds, because they wanted a leader they could control during the First World War, given the Arabian peninsula's proximity to Turkey. When oil was discovered, the US acquired the drilling rights and let Ibn Saud treat the royalties as his personal income – their anti-colonial attitude preventing them from interfering in the Kingdom's affairs. During the Cold War, both the Saudi King Faisal and the US were desperate to depose Nasser in Egypt, whose populist Arab unity rhetoric was gaining Soviet support. After failing in an assassination attempt, the Saudis entangled Nasser in a dispute in the Yemen, which stretched his army and gave Israel an ideal opportunity to attack in 1967. The Saudis and the US also funded the *Mujahadeen* to fight the Soviets in Afghanistan, and in the process created Bin Laden and his army. They then encouraged and funded Saddam Hussein to make war with Shi'ite Iran after their Shah puppet was deposed. When the war ended, and he refused to disband his army, they set him up to invade Kuwait, thereby providing the perfect pretext to destroy him.

The full effects of the latest ill-fated invasion and occupation of Iraq will not be felt for many years, but already it has upset the balance of power in the region. For decades, many countries in the Middle East have been governed as dictatorships, and the West has turned a blind eye to suppression of human rights and the endemic corruption of the Al Sauds and their ilk in return for cheap oil. Now, the green shoots of democracy are starting to show, and the ruling families are facing new pressures.

It is now clear that the Bush White House had no coherent plan to manage Iraq after Saddam was toppled, let alone introduce democracy to a country comprising ethnic groups that have been fighting each other for centuries. The election results show Iraq bitterly divided into political parties on a purely religious basis, and civil war has broken out.

Elections across the region have followed a similar trend – the Islamic fundamentalists are on the ascendancy. Islam is the glue that holds Arab society together, and it is therefore understandable that given a lack of traditional political parties, and with no history of democracy, voters will turn to their religious leaders. These tend to represent the extremes, rather than the centre, of public opinion.

Recent results in Palestine bear witness to what can happen when democracy is introduced to a society that has been oppressed for decades – the extremists (Hamas) were the main beneficiaries. In Egypt, the Muslim Brotherhood (motto: "Islam is the answer") finished second, despite a dirty tricks campaign organised by a president and his government desperately clinging to power. Here in Bahrain, several Shi'ite groups boycotted the last elections in 2002 as they were angry at the level of authority retained

by the King under the new constitution. However, they intend to stand in the next elections, later this year. Shi'ites comprise the majority of the population, but the royal family and the ruling class are Sunni. Tension is rising and sporadic violence has already broken out. The royal family knows that pressure for change will increase once the electorate is more fairly represented in parliament. There are already a significant number of elected Muslim fundamentalist MPs seeking to use democracy to undermine Bahrain's history of religious tolerance, and move towards an Islamic state. Last year, they voted to extend gender segregation to Bahrain University, in the teeth of protests from the students, and every other week some hare-brained scheme is proposed, such as banning alcohol. But for the King's veto power and control of the Shura Council, Bahrain would already be well down the path to emulating neighbouring Saudi Arabia, whose citizens flock across the causeway at the weekend to get drunk and make merry.

Most educated Arabs know that their people are not ready for democracy in the Western sense. They support the local dictator because he keeps the peace and lets the middle classes get on with making tax-free cash without the threat of socialism. Many Islamic parties see socialism as the solution to the inordinate gulf between the obscene wealth of the oil-rich Sheiks, and dirt-poor villagers.

The trebling of oil prices in the last few years, coupled with repatriation of funds from abroad post 9/11, has flooded the region with cash. The banks, always a reliable reflection of the economy, have never had it so good. Real estate prices and the stock markets have rocketed, and government coffers are overflowing. The financial, tourism and construction sectors in particular are booming. One in five of the world's cranes are currently in Dubai, the world's largest construction site and the money-laundering capital of the Middle East. Governments are privatizing state-owned monopolies and the region has become obsessed with the stock market. There is so much money splashing around that investors are looking further afield for investment opportunities – P&O, Daimler Chrysler, Staffordshire Water, and Park Avenue, for example.

This largesse has postponed problems that have been growing for some time. The growth of the internet and satellite news in the region has increased political awareness amongst the masses. Some countries (such as Kuwait, Bahrain and Qatar) are trying to manage change by introducing quasi-elected parliaments. However, either because these parliaments are toothless, or because they are packed with fundamentalists or royalist placemen, they often make the problem worse. Once people get a sniff of democracy, they tend to want more, even if they are not ready for it. The West would be foolish to assume that Arab democracy will result in more stable, western-friendly governments. If anything, elected leaders will be more likely to reflect public opinion, which is hostile to America because of its unconditional support of Israel. This is something that Bush and his advisors cannot comprehend – democracy in the Arab world is not a panacea for its problems, and in some cases could make things far worse, if the lunatics do take over the asylum. □

DISPATCHES



— from
Bahrain



Ibn Saud, the first monarch of Saudi Arabia, meeting Roosevelt in 1945 on board the USS Quincy

The author has asked for confidentiality because he works in Bahrain

Liberal internationalism as a biological phenomenon

Robert Henderson looks at the behaviour of Western elites through the prism of evolutionary theory

Liberal internationalist elites have fractured societies which previously enjoyed a high degree of racial and cultural homogeneity by permitting the mass immigration of the racially and culturally different. They have undermined national security and reduced domestic employment opportunities by removing protection for their own agriculture, commerce and industry. They have wilfully suppressed their own cultures through manipulation of the education system in particular and public policy generally. They have engaged in a ceaseless propaganda conducted through the mass media which diminishes the native culture and promotes the interests of minority groups. They have dissolved national democratic control by entrapping their countries in treaties such as those which empower the EU, NAFTA, the WTO and the UN, the consequence of which is to restrict greatly the scope for national action.

Beyond the boundaries of their own countries, these elites have inflated through aid the populations of Third World countries beyond that which their societies can naturally support. In addition,

the traditional social and economic arrangements of these countries are eroded by direct Western political interference and trade rules which encourage cash crops over farming to feed their own people. The consequence of all this is an ever growing number of people in the developing world who have a desperate urge to

move to the rich West, something made ever easier by the liberals' support, tacit or open, for continuing mass immigration into the West. At the same time, the populations of the liberal elites' own countries are falling and are ever more vulnerable to the effects of the mass immigration being promoted by the elite. The necessary eventual consequence is the effective colonisation of Western states by immigrants.

The declining birthrates of the West are themselves the fruit of liberal elite decisions to permit abortion on demand, actively to promote the feminist agenda and to create economic circumstances which discourage reproduction; for example, it is increasingly difficult for a family in Britain to be raised on a single average male wage.

The relaxation of trade barriers weakens their own countries and leaves them ever more vulnerable as they become progressively less self-sufficient, while promoting the wealth and self-sufficiency not merely of other states comparable in size, but states – particularly India and China – whose individual populations exceed the combined populations of Europe and North America.

Western elites are doing just about everything an organism should *not* do to protect itself: allowing large numbers of those outside the social group to enter the group's territory, removing resources from

their territory and giving those resources to those outside the group and, most bewilderingly, assisting competitor groups to expand their population whilst restricting their own.

Why are liberal elites exhibiting such ostensibly self-destructive behaviour? The answer may lie in the fact that elites think of themselves as a separate group, a group which extends beyond national and cultural boundaries. There is nothing new in this. The medieval aristocracies of Western Europe thought themselves part of a chivalric whole. The putative advantage to the elites of international elite solidarity is that it allows them to weaken their dependence upon their immediate (native) populations.

How elites evolve

England provides a model of how elites can survive through evolution for a very long time. From the 14th Century onwards, the general trend was to broaden the elite. In the long term, the inexorable movement was towards parliamentary government and from monarchical power. During this development the wishes of the masses were largely but not entirely ignored – the masses made their presence felt through rioting (the historian Lewis Namier memorably described the government of 18th Century England as "aristocracy tempered by riot").

As the franchise broadened, the masses were able to exercise an ever larger degree of democratic control, because politics was still national and a political party had to respond to the electors' wishes. The elite resented this control over their behaviour and looked around for a way to diminish democratic influence. They found the means to do it in internationalism.

In a sovereign country, politicians cannot say this or that cannot be done, if it is practical to do it. That is a considerable block on elite misbehaviour. So the elites seem to have decided that the way round this unfortunate restraint on their misbehaviour was to commit their countries to treaties which would remove the opportunity for the electorate to exercise control over policy. In the British case, the most notable example is the Treaty of Rome and the subsequent treaties which have tied Britain into the EU. Vast swathes of policy are no longer within the control of the British parliament because of these treaties. Add in the treaties tying Britain to the UN and the WTO and the commitment of every mainstream British party to them, and democratic control has essentially gone. What has happened in Britain is mirrored to a lesser or greater degree throughout the West.

Does liberal internationalism make evolutionary sense?

Assuming the ultimate biological imperative for any organism is to pass on as many of its copies of its genes as possible to future generations, the liberal elites might seem to have a considerable advantage because the richer and more powerful the person the greater the potential for more and better quality mates and consequent offspring. The problem with this argument is that elites in the West do not breed prolifically and, indeed, have on average fewer children



The government of 18th Century England: "aristocracy tempered by riot". Above: the burning of Newgate Prison during the Gordon Riots.

than those of the native masses whom they despise. Cultural norms have seemingly subverted biology.

But cultural norms are ultimately an expression of biology, so how has this occurred? I will offer this hypothesis: there is a strong natural selfishness in the individual. This is held in check to a greater or lesser degree by the social arrangements of a society. A society which emphasises tradition will rein in selfishness. Such societies will have a strong sense of 'tribe' and frequently a religion which emphasises the need to have children, demands charitable behaviour and threatens punishment in an afterlife. There will also be an absence of any easy means of contraception – and quite probably a religious ban on it – strictly enforced marriage and the lack of a welfare state. All of these things will reinforce social cohesion and the immediate interdependence of individuals on one another.

Such societies are anathema to the modern liberal mind, whose perfect society is one from which national feeling has been leached and whose members are held together by only a shared sense of 'rational' desires, such as a fair justice system and a good material standard of living. Having no sense of tribe they will not see it as a duty to reproduce.

Having easy access to contraception, they can copulate at will, yet have few children. They even have an ideology which tells them that having children is simply a 'life choice'. Selfishness is made respectable. A society has been created in which the restraints on selfishness have been loosened too far. The consequence is that the liberal elite behave in a way to satisfy themselves at the expense of their descendants.

What counts as 'biological fitness' in human beings?

All organisms other than man can only pass on their genes in the most obvious and straightforward way. The organism breeds and its descendants breed or do not breed. In animals which engage in extensive parental care, what might be called cultural inheritance plays a part in the transmission process, with members of the species varying in their ability to nurture their offspring. The young of such animals rely on the example of their parents and, in the case of social animals, other adults to acquire many of the tactics needed to survive.

But even the biologically fittest of the most socially advanced non-human animal cannot pass on an advantage to their offspring which in any way approaches that which a human can pass to their children. Indeed, man's behaviour in passing non-genetic advantage from one generation to the next is so radically different from that of any other organism that the biological imperatives which drive the rest of the natural world may have been subordinated to this immense ability to pass on non-genetic advantage. This ability is driven by the unique nature of man, who consciously identifies how advantage may be gained and passed on. Biological fitness in humans may be predominantly the ability to pass on non-genetic, rather than genetic, advantage.

It might be argued that inherited non-genetic advantage will dissipate over the generations and that few families will maintain their privilege over more than a few generations. But the genetic inheritance of a family line is soon dissipated, reducing by 50% per generation. In other words, non-genetic inheritance is at worst no poorer a bet in maintaining fitness than genetic inheritance and in some cases a consid-

erably better one, because the inherited advantage can be passed through a larger number of generations than any meaningful genetic legacy – there are aristocratic families in England today who descend from nobles who came over with William the Conqueror in 1066.

If this is a correct interpretation of biological fitness in men, it makes sense for elites to grab as much power, wealth and privilege for themselves. But the haves must create social circumstances which allow them to pass their non-genetic advantages to descendants. It is no good enraging the have-nots to such a degree that they simply kill the haves or take their privileges away or changing the conditions of a society so radically that the elite loses control. Yet the latter is precisely what modern liberal elites appear to be doing.

Can the liberal elite change?

It is undoubtedly true that elites as a group only ever have one settled principle, namely, to do whatever is necessary to secure their power, wealth and privilege. It is also true that liberals have at the personal level long feared the consequences of non-white immigration – *vide* the way they choose to live in very white worlds themselves – and since 9/11 have begun to openly acknowledge that heterogeneous societies are a problem. Many probably want change. The difficulty is that by internationalising their ideology through treaties and membership of supranational bodies such as the UN and the EU and a commitment to *laissez faire* economics, the liberal elites have surrendered control of their own individual national destinies and hence their power readily to change matters.

To this must be added the sheer inertia which is built into an international system which has grown since 1945 into an immense heap of political and bureaucratic power and privilege. An international army of politicians and bureaucrats have the most vested of interests in maintaining the status quo.

Most important is the existence of large populations of unassimilated and probably unassimilable recent immigrants and their descendants. These populations manipulate the political process through their increasing electoral power and the tacit threat of serious violence to ensure further immigration from their respective groups, to influence foreign policy (including foreign aid) and to maintain the practice of allowing unimpeded remittances from the host country to the ancestral country.

The liberal elites have seemingly adopted a suicidal strategy. By forgetting the importance of the tribe or, rather, mistaking what the tribe is – ie, their own national group – they have set themselves on the road to oblivion. Evolution is not just about winners. □



Hillary Clinton: a liberal internationalist case study. By restricting herself to only one child she might be thought to have harmed her 'fitness' in the *genetic* sense. However, by redirecting her energies to advancing herself politically she has advanced her 'fitness' in the *cultural* sense: her attitudes and values are now much more likely – alas – to prevail in the years to come.

Robert Henderson
writes *Right Now's* 'Joy
of Diversity' column

Cameron, council houses, and the white man's burden

Stuart Maclean says the white working class is despised by the middle class, and detested by the political Left

Judging by the fevered speculation of so many political pundits and social commentators, the spectre of the white proletariat is haunting the land. Certainly, it is difficult to recall a time when its voting intentions were scrutinised with such interest, and in the aftermath of the BNP breakthrough in Barking and Dagenham the establishment's post-mortem is exposing some uncomfortable strains in the political consensus. *Pace* David Goodhart¹, it appears solidarity and diversity do cancel each other out, and the political classes are slowly reflecting on the fact that the pursuit of these contradictory ideals has borne down most heavily on the native working class. The latter have been a distinctly neglected constituency of late. From a high point in the 1980s, when the Conservatives under Thatcher's leadership cemented their electoral hegemony by assiduously cultivating the votes of the C2s, the political cachet of this class has declined to a point where its parochial aspirations have been seen almost as a distraction from the principal objective of gaining marginal middle class voters in geographically select locations.



Valence Circus in the Becontree estate, photographed in 1930. The largest council housing estate in the world was built by the London County Council after 1921 to reward the families of soldiers who had served in the First World War. It is now giving the BNP its first real sniff of municipal influence in the south

This has clearly been a safe strategy whilst no obvious working class alternative offered itself, but the BNP's growing strength in more traditional working class areas has been prompting considerable unease amongst the more vulnerably placed Labour MPs. Having effectively fought a parallel old-Labour political campaign against the BNP in Barking for almost a decade, John Cruddas has been more prescient regarding the long term political risks of this calibration than most, but it would be unwise to assume that his appeal for the party to adopt a more working class-friendly platform carries much more weight now, still less that the election results herald the re-emergence of the working class as a prominent force in mainstream British politics. The BNP breakthrough after all did not come out of the blue. Margaret Hodge's outspoken remarks prompted unprecedented media focus on the sources of blue collar resentment, but the tone of the May elections was nevertheless set by the nauseating spectacle of David Cameron's ethical bicycling, and a deliberate eschewal of populist platforms. The political strategy of Central Office is instructive in this respect; the green manifesto testifies to the dominant clout of the new bourgeoisie, a social stratum

lampooned by Peter Hitchens and marked out by a socially tolerant, deracinated outlook. To such delicate consciences, a populist core vote strategy is likely to be repellent, and their ethical post-materialism (ie, wealth) puts them above the vulgar politics of affordable housing. Moreover, as David Worsley hinted in his excellent article in *RN* 43,² this re-positioning stands every chance of being more permanent than that undertaken by the Labour Party, which, despite its chattering class roots, still retains the advantages of being a catch-all party that has fewer scruples when it comes to striking populist poses.

Tory modernization, by contrast, represents a more consistent ideological project and seems far more likely to split the party irreparably between its traditional core and the ascendant libertarian wing. How long these cracks can be papered over is something only time will answer, but in the short term at least the marginalizing of social conservatism, and the pursuit of the liberal centre seems to be paying the Tories a healthy dividend in the capital. In terms of sober political calculation, writing off Dagenham is a small price to pay for gaining gentrified Hammersmith & Fulham. Moreover, if demography is destiny, the forces of history are moving sharply against the BNP in the capital, a fact too often overlooked by their apologists. The more one looks at the BNP's political momentum, the more fragile it looks. The rapid growth of the immigrant population in Barking, for instance, has given the party its first real sniff of municipal influence in the south, but this same dynamic is just as likely to seal its eclipse; after all, its concentration on Barking & Dagenham follows its *de facto* abandonment of Tower Hamlets. Less obviously, but with equally profound political effects, former working class areas are being gentrified at breakneck speed, a fact noted with some bitterness in Michael Collins' nostalgic biography of London's white working class, *The Likes of Us*, and this represents a most unpromising trend for the BNP. The political history of Millwall in this respect is prophetic.

The ward famously elected the BNP's first councillor in 1993, a reflection of widespread anger over the influx of Asian families, and the asset-stripping predation of the London Docklands Development Corporation, described accurately by local Labour veteran Terry Johns as a gang of estate agents. In 2004, Millwall elected the first Tory on to Tower Hamlets council, a difference in political fortunes partly attributable to changes in the housing market. Widespread slum clearances and factory/warehouse conversions, the forced relocation of many white working class families, and rampant real estate speculation did more to undermine the BNP than the political hysteria generated at the time, and the penthouses of Canary Wharf highlight a wider problem. Herbert Morrison once dreamed of building the Tories out of London by expanding social housing provision in the capital, but in 2006 it seems the BNP are the most likely to be neutered by a housing market which increasingly shuts out the white working class (the Tories have consolidated their grip on Millwall, the BNP did not even stand in 2006). This latest kick in the teeth is symptomatic of a wider malaise in working class life, for a class which

used to have history on its side it is looking strangely redundant in the capital. Inner London boroughs like Southwark, the focus of Collins' biography, which were once the ancestral domain of the white working class have long since given way to the loft apartments, *latté* and cultural diversity which virtually define the metropolitan experience. Everywhere one looks, the social and cultural footprint of the indigenous working class in the capital seems to be disappearing, a loss evident in the near disappearance of the Cockney vernacular amongst white schoolchildren in inner-city areas.

Ultimately the strength of working class culture and community was built upon a conducive economic base, but widespread de-skilling, the importation of cheap labour and the erosion of Britain's manufacturing base have removed this prop, and with 50% of projected new jobs requiring degree qualifications in 2012 this will prove a difficult obstacle to overcome. As a result of this creeping obsolescence of the native working class, the inner city areas of London are increasingly the domain of the liberal middle class and the migrants who clean up after them. This is the 'urban edgy' environment which estate agents talk about when they market squalid inner city areas that have attracted the requisite number of internet cafés and tacky wine bars – a distinctly modern twist to Galbraith's private affluence and public squalor. The authentically working class community is increasingly out of step with such a world, and is fast becoming a form of nostalgia, kept alive by a diaspora which has carved out replicas of traditional south and east London culture in suburbs like Bexley, Eltham and Welling. As Collins has put it, "a new divide is opening up between the multicultural city dwellers and their burden, the culturally impoverished, hickish whites everywhere else. It was once the cockney's ignorance of the country that made him the subject of middle class mockery; now it is the fact that he doesn't live in the modern inner city."

The phrase 'parallel lives' was originally coined to denote the hermetically sealed lives of whites and Asians in Oldham but it might just as easily describe the social estrangement between the professional classes and their poorer white cousins. The results of this zoning are evident in the increasingly regimented worldview of the graduate *Guardian*-reading class; Nick Cohen's remark that a young BBC type in the Great Wen is unlikely ever to come into social contact with anyone who holds socially conservative views conveys a very real sociological insight; open mindedness only thrives in higher income ghettos.

In short, it is social geography rather than Leftist conspiracy which fuels the culture war, and the changing patterns of middle class identity are particularly pronounced amongst the capital's gentrifiers. The differences are particularly evident in relation to their engagement with the wider community. Suffice to say most of the children in middle class households living in enclaves like Telegraph Hill in Deptford do not educate their children locally, nor do they take much part in the wider community or play the civic role (eg. councillors, school governors) traditionally synonymous with middle class virtue, and this pattern of 'low social obligation' is repeated all over gentrified areas. For all the talk about sustainable communities, this endemic process of working class white flight, immigration, and aggressive real estate speculation remains the template for urban living, and it is within this social milieu that the new brand of metropolitan conservatism is being fashioned. In stark contrast to

the populist C2 conservatism of the Thatcher years, this ideological shift has left an unbridgeable fault line between the classes, a divide which I think Ferdinand Mount is correct in saying is sharpening³. Nowhere is this contrast sharper than in relation to multiculturalism. The middle classes are increasingly defined by a certain 'cultural mobility', exemplified in the institutionalised gap year for middle class youth, and this declining attachment to place and territory makes the exotica of multiculturalism more appealing to the privileged than the local attachments born from lack of opportunity. As Michael Collins has pointed out, there are many progressives who see the survival of the white working class as an atavistic remnant which threatens their brittle multicultural arcadia. In their commentaries on working class support for the BNP for example, it is difficult not to pick up on the currents of fear and loathing which are never far from the surface. It is noticeable, for example, how easily media pundits revert to a therapeutic jargon – people invariably need to be educated, have their concerns listened to, and have things explained – as if the primary problem was their low intelligence. Indeed the Rowntree Trust's report's does more or less make the connection between low educational attainment and BNP voting (*The BNP; The Roots of its Appeal*, 2006).

There is a grave cost to this short sighted ignorance, for the BNP breakthrough still poses critical questions regarding the long term health of the welfare state, and more thoughtful commentators on the Left have been grappling with this dilemma for some time. The inescapable backdrop to these discussions is Goodhart's infamous article in *Prospect* in which the hapless author posed a question which is becoming increasingly germane in the light of recent events, namely, is there a tipping point at which cultural fragmentation impairs the ability of a society to provide the generous systems of social provision typical of Europe, and push it towards a more miserly US style system? Can the sacrifices involved in such redistributive transfers of wealth be accepted when social solidarity is undermined by the pursuit of diversity? Goodhart, famously, was of the opinion that these two principles could not be reconciled and if his position has not been universally adopted by all on the Left there are at least an increasing number of progressive thinkers who recognise the latent tensions which multiculturalism introduces into the structure of the welfare state.

Nowhere is this conflict so pronounced than in relation to housing which has figured prominently in the BNP's successes in the capital, and the explosive intersection of race and housing policy is the subject of a recent publication which has prompted considerable debate on the Left. *The New East End*, edited by Geoff Dench and Kate Gavron, is an extremely thought-provoking book, not least in the way it resurrects old ghosts. The choice of Bethnal Green as the focus of the study, for example, is a particularly poignant one, this area being the focus of Wilmott and Young's famous sociological study of working class communities in 1957⁴.

Needless to say, the travails of this community have since been given an infinitely less sympathetic airing than they were a generation ago when they still at least merited the condescension of compassion. In some senses the problems seem remarkably constant, centring around the importance of belonging and community, and the challenges to these values thrown

Continued overleaf



David Cameron: a man with an 'Eye' for demographic and cultural changes in London?

Notes

1. The editor of the Left-of-centre journal *Prospect* wrote an important piece in February 2004, criticizing multiculturalism for its incompatibility with true liberalism and social cohesion.
2. "Room on the Right for two?", David Worsley, *RN* 43, December 2003.
3. See *Mind the Gap*, Ferdinand Mount, 2004.
4. *Family and Kinship in East London*, Peter Wilmott and Michael Young, 1957. The book's somewhat romanticised picture of working class life in the East End retains its influence to this day.

Notes – cont'd

5. A direct result of Tory policy on housing. The right to buy has decimated the social rented sector at a time when the lifting of rent controls has entailed soaring living costs. The assured short hold tenancy introduced, like the deregulation of rents, to stimulate the private rented sector has contributed massively to the UK's homelessness problem.

6. *Observer*, 26 February 2006, "In the East End, They Still Hate Means Testing".

Stuart Maclean is the pen-name of a civil servant

Continued from p17

up by 'social progress'. Much of Wilmott and Young's study for example concentrated on the feelings of isolation and loneliness experienced by the elderly as a result of the slum clearances and the relocation of their children to the new towns. Fifty years on, public sector housing policy similarly conspires against the children of white families being housed near their parents; mothers aged 50 and over were found to be the most likely to harbour racist views precisely for this reason.


The explanation behind such outcomes and the ensuing resentment lies in the systemic priority of need as a criterion for distributing scarce local authority stock – under such rules ethnic minority claimants will tend to be disproportionately favoured. To take just one indicator pertinent to homelessness law – Asian, particularly Bangladeshi, households are typically much larger than white ones and hence more likely to be classified as 'overcrowded' and in need of rehousing. Unsurprisingly, Tower Hamlets has both the largest Asian population of any London borough, and the most acute overcrowding problem in the capital. It also has the poorest ethnic minority population in London, further increasing its claim on state assistance *vis-à-vis* the host community. When pondering how this rigged starting line affects attitudes, it is important to recognise just how critical access to

affordable social housing is for ordinary working class families in the capital. With extortionate rents, and the chronic insecurity of tenure which characterises the private sector, access to this precious resource is a matter of economic survival⁵.

That the fashionable middle class is able to buy itself out of reliance on public services accounts in large part for its more liberal views. *The New East End's* statistics indicating that white couples born in Stepney and Bethnal Green are more racist than those born outside the borough bear testimony to the differing social outlooks rooted in class differences. The authors of the study were clearly worried about the iniquities of this system, and their troubled reflections have been shared by several commentators in the liberal broadsheets. Will Hutton's solution to the dilemma⁶ is to move away from means testing and towards a system based on universal provision and reciprocity, and this at least has the merit of consistency and generosity, but it remains to be seen whether such a system could cope with the strain of an immigration policy which is resulting in huge net migration levels into areas experiencing acute housing strain. The BNP's leader in London is already taking credit for Barking and Dagenham's newly unveiled social housing programme, but if existing allocation rules stay the same they could simply be building themselves out of power. □

The death of civil society – with apologies

Joan Northam says there is no such thing as 'sorry' these days



Have you noticed how rare it is nowadays to hear anyone utter that little word 'sorry'?

I've been very fortunate in the several workmen I've employed to undertake repairs and maintenance at home. They've been, without exception, competent, honest and hard-working, polite, and even when sometimes the work has been lengthy and complicated, have maintained a cheerful and positive approach, fortified by numerous cups of tea. There is only one thing they lack – in common with, as it seems to me, the majority of people today – the word "sorry" doesn't seem to be part of their vocabulary. How does it come about that otherwise polite and considerate people lack the ability to utter an apology?

My workmen have dealt with the occasional mistake without complaint, and put it right. But that action, much appreciated by me, has never been accompanied by a verbal apology. A plumber who replaced the ancient and worn out pipework in my central heating system could not have been, on such a difficult and lengthy job, more agreeable, patient and cheerful. But his enthusiasm for the benefit of new 'click-fit' pipes suffered a major blow when on refilling the system, three major leaks quickly revealed themselves. All were at junctions of the pipe network where they had clearly not been properly connected and one ruined half the newly-decorated walls in my dining room. He dealt with the problem as quickly as possible, and the system is now fully sealed and in working order.

Never once during the time following the leaks did he apologise for the damage. True, he rectified the problem. True, he reduced his total charges to allow for the necessary redecoration, though that was

a direct result of my intervention. He agreed immediately and without resistance, but he didn't suggest it himself. And he never apologised.

How much does this matter? Well, practically, not at all. The room was redecorated, the central heating works, and I didn't have to pay the full amount of his bill. But wouldn't you expect someone in that position to have said they were sorry? It would have been the first word I uttered, had I been the plumber.

There is today amongst many people what seems to be a sense of revulsion when it comes to apologies. It is as though they see expressing regret as somehow demeaning themselves, putting themselves in the wrong. Never mind that when an apology is called for, they clearly *are* in the wrong! And what is there essentially to be ashamed of in that? Everyone makes mistakes, and sometimes we even deliberately overstep the boundaries of civilised behaviour and intentionally say or do something that causes offence. Making mistakes is just part of being human. But deliberately being hurtful and unkind is avoidable, and if we choose it, we are guilty of at best bad manners, at worst either physical or verbal abuse.

Either way, an apology is due. It costs nothing but a recognition of responsibility and a temporary willingness to give priority to the feelings of another. But for some reason, this seems beyond most people. Decent, polite, civilised people, whose manners are otherwise beyond reproach falter and fall at this hurdle.

Admittedly, if someone shows his acceptance of responsibility by his actions, that is a form of apology, and in some ways the most important one. But just uttering the word 'sorry' is not only appropriate,

it acts as an emollient to hurt feelings and enables complete closure on the situation.

My son, in his mid-thirties, has noticed this in connection with some members of the awkward squad at work. In the particular case he cited, the only action possible and necessary to heal a rift was that the man whose refusal to cooperate had caused the altercation should say he was sorry. It would have taken all the sting out of the situation, and had it been rejected, no further responsibility for the offence would have lain at the door of the offender. But he dug his heels in and refused to offer it.

My son said, in baffled and exasperated tones, that it was so simple, it cost nothing, and everything could have been back to normal but for the lack of contrition on the part of the intransigent responsible. But of course it does cost, particularly when the one responsible knows he has caused the trouble. It costs an admission of that responsibility, an admission of inappropriate action or words, a shouldering of his share of blame.

I suppose that it should come as no great surprise that the British public sees any admission of individual mistakes and misjudgements as something to be shunned at all costs. Given the behaviour of politicians and many public figures over the past few years, who deny self-evident truths with a brass neck that defies belief, to say nothing of their total failure to accept responsibility for any of their actions that are clearly wrong, we are not richly endowed with examples to follow.

It is all part of a cult of the individual that has, over the years, meant each man is a law unto himself. The result has been a growing and now well-entrenched belief that whatever I decide, do or say is right, however painful the results it may have on others. "Man is the measure of all things" now means "I am the captain of my fate, I am the master of my soul", and the devil take the hindmost. The results are plain to see, in the breakdown of family relationships and the knock-on effect in the breakdown and fragmentation of society. It will soon become apparent that Mrs Thatcher's much-ridiculed remark: "There is no such thing as society" has come true.

She did not, of course, either mean or intend what has been implied, yet the words are prophetic, for in a way quite other than she envisaged, we are well on the way to the wholesale destruction of society as we have known it. Her comment was intended to point out the importance of the individuals who made up the abstract we call 'society', each accepting responsibility for their own words, actions and lives. What is now happening is just the opposite – no one has to accept any responsibility for anything at all, including their own actions. Somebody else must always be to blame for anything unpleasant that happens to you. If you fall off a swing in a council-owned playground, breaking your arm, the council is to blame and must pay damages.

Accidents may happen, but now the word has been redefined to mean anything that happens to you that has disagreeable consequences is always somebody else's fault. We are now seeing strong indications that our political leaders in particular increasingly believe that nothing bad, uncomfortable or seriously unpleasant *ought* ever to happen.

It is in no way minimising the misery of those left homeless, injured and bereaved to remark that, unfortunately, such things do happen from time to time because that's the way the world is. If you

live prosperously on the fertile land at the foot of a volcano, there is always the risk that the previously inactive monster will erupt and destroy your property and even take your life, if you have insufficient warning.

We saw this determination not to accept the consequences of personal choice as far back as the miners' strike. At that time, many groups and organisations raised funds to enable the families of those affected by the strike to escape some of its consequences. But the miners had opted for the strike, and were therefore no longer drawing their wages.

We were told how dreadful it was that so many of their children would be without Christmas presents, because the family couldn't afford to buy them. But that surely was a direct result of the fathers' decision to withdraw their labour? I could only think that had my father or my husband been in a similar position, the family would have had to go without Christmas presents. If we could not afford them, the children would, as part of the family, inevitably bear their own share of the consequences. There was an attempt to raise money to enable miners' families to have their usual summer holidays. In a similar position, we would have done without holidays.


But of course, Britain was then still a country in which by and large people did take responsibility for the results of their own actions. We knew what the rules were, and we also knew the consequences if we disobeyed them. Those were the days (in the 1950s and early 1960s) when it was still considered normal even by burglars, that if they were caught, they would be punished, sentenced and imprisoned. Any suggestion then that an intruder who suffered injury in the course of his illegal actions might seek compensation from those whose property he had intended to steal would have met with the appropriate dismissal, and probably in addition to the outrage, some incredulous laughter. He had broken the law. He paid the penalty.

Since then, several generations of children have been raised by parents who increasingly failed to impose any family discipline. They have entered society to add to the growing numbers of those who live according to their own immediate whims and desires without regard to the effects these may have on others, and who in addition expect to be rescued by the taxpayer from any undesirable consequences of their own choices.

No surprise, then, that few today see making a convincing verbal apology as a necessary if sometimes unpalatable requirement. No one must make any requirement of anyone else. But someone must nonetheless pay for our inconvenience. Well, we do. And those of us who do are, by and large, the much reviled Middle-Englanders, those who obey the law or stump up the penalty, those who work diligently and pay their taxes, much of which are then devoted to propping up, bailing out and otherwise accommodating the selfish, law-breaking and disruptive members of our so-called "society". That can continue only until there is simply not enough in the kitty to fund all these counter-productive payments. And it will happen. The money will run out. No society infected with such a soft, sentimental attitude towards those whose misfortunes have been largely self-inflicted can continue to prosper whilst it fosters such phoney and misplaced compassion.

But for now, we are all laws unto ourselves. Selfishness is king. Society is truly dying. □

Joan Northam writes
from Coulsdon in Surrey



The Mendacious Colours of Democracy: The Anatomy of Benevolent Lying

Alex Rubner, Imprint Academic, Exeter, 2006, viii + 296 pps, pb, £17.95

Reviewed by David Worsley

The publisher's synopsis for this book accurately summarises Alex Rubner's purpose as being to defend politicians who "engage in benevolent lying because obstruction by stupid voters will otherwise stop them advancing the national interest as they see it".

Readers of *Right Now!* could be forgiven for thinking that this précis might describe an extended *Guardian*-style assault on the ignorance and xenophobia of the electorate, accompanied by praise for those politicians who are suppressing details about European integration or immigration policy until such a time as the public are more 'enlightened', or at any rate are forced to 'come to terms' with the predetermined future that awaits them. However, Rubner has developed a much more measured and thought-provoking thesis, with most of the case studies he cites being drawn from his own specialist area of economic policy. Indeed, his work over several decades as a government advisor has given him inside knowledge of the sort of situations that arise. Furthermore, he has previously written on the relationship between shareholders and company directors, and his observations on the 'tail wags dog' aspects of corporate politics have been transferred to a wider stage in this book.

Much space is dedicated to a discussion of the ethics and psychology of lying. Rubner argues that a lie is justifiable when it is both well-intentioned and successfully achieves its objective, and he supports this claim with examples of wartime deception that few would find controversial. Rubner is able to transfer his attention to the political field by using as his main source the surprisingly frank diaries and memoirs of figures such as Harold Macmillan, R H Crossman, Roy Jenkins and Dennis Healey. These men openly admitted to lying, albeit many years after the event, and often in



Books

"Reading maketh a full man"

— Bacon

obscure areas of fiscal policy. Rubner uses his expertise to assess the necessity and effectiveness of such lies, and it is hard to avoid sympathy for the British Chancellors of the 1960s and 1970s who, when trapped in a quagmire of economic decline and political instability, found dishonesty to be the best policy. Indeed, Rubner is sharply critical of Roy Jenkins for *not* finding a mendacious way of appearing to satisfy the Labour Left's desire to "soak the rich" without actually imposing the punitive tax rates that Jenkins himself knew were economically damaging.

However, the most topical material concerns politicians' use of contrived external constraints in order to remove their policies from the arena of democratic debate. Readers will remember how Nigel Lawson used high interest rates to informally peg sterling to the Deutschmark, before John Major attempted to set this unpopular policy in stone by joining the ERM. This is but one version of a ploy whereby politicians transfer power to a body such as the European Union, the IMF or the United Nations, and then claim to be impotent when criticised for the effects of policies that they had always intended to pursue. Although believing them to be justified in certain circumstances, Rubner unashamedly calls such tactics anti-democratic, not least because they violate the principle that no parliament can bind its successors.

Today, the power of the European Commission and Court of Human Rights has expanded the range of external constraints well beyond the field of economics, as Michael Howard discovered last year when the Conservatives' immigration policy was declared to be illegal. The populist Right thus correctly argue that however well-intentioned they may originally have been, the array of transnational and judicial institutions that constrain governments and legislatures are now at best a tool used

by politicians to evade responsibility for policies that they secretly support, or at worst an elitist conspiracy that makes a sham of democracy. In Britain, just in the last few months, we have seen the very politicians who supported the 1998 Human Rights Act blame their own legislation for their inability to deal effectively with crime and illegal immigration. It is tempting to imagine that if this political class and its constitutional innovations were swept away, many of our current woes would be soluble through honest politics. However, the problems described by Rubner cannot be avoided by those who seek to change the situation. Even if the populist movements of contemporary Europe are successful in dislodging the present system, consigning federalism and multiculturalism to the dustbin of history, and charting a course for the future of the West that is in keeping with the common sense of the majority, there will probably be difficult decisions to be made. One can easily think of issues in the fields of environmental protection, sustainable development and statutory retirement ages where very many voters will not like to hear the policies that any realistic assessment of the facts would dictate. If the underhand methods developed by the current regime to circumvent democracy are abolished, the rulers of a new Europe will have to be masters in the arts of leadership and persuasion. Helping the people face up to the challenges of the future without Rubner's benevolent lying will be a worthy but difficult task.

David Worsley is a freelance writer

Race Differences in Intelligence: An Evolutionary Analysis

Richard Lynn, Washington Summit Publishers, Augusta, GA, 322pps, hb, US\$17.95

Reviewed by Leslie Jones

According to the geographer Ellsworth Huntington, author of *Civilization and Climate*, heat discourages physical and mental effort. Man is no less susceptible to the effects of temperature than the crayfish. In his latest work, Richard Lynn adopts a somewhat similar perspective. Innate mental differences between the races are linked to climate. Racial inheritance is the result of past training in a particular environment. Geography is destiny.

The germ of this book is two seminal articles published by *Mankind Quarterly* in 1991. In the second article, 'The evolution of race differences in intelligence', Lynn addressed the origins of the ethnic IQ differences comprehensively documented in the previous paper.

Why are East Asians (median IQ 105) and Europeans (median IQ 99) more intelligent on average than other races? Lynn's

answer in a nutshell is that these peoples' ancestors had the daunting and unique challenge of keeping warm and obtaining food in winter. He contends that this problem constituted a severe selective pressure for intelligence leading to an increase in brain size and thereby mental ability. The author also infers that because the East Asians and the Europeans were subjected to extreme cold stress, they experienced more frequent genetic mutations, including mutations for higher intelligence, than other populations.

In his new book, Lynn ranks ten races according to the severity of the winter temperatures in their native regions. He discerns a general correspondence between coldest winter monthly temperatures and average brain size. Although there are populations in the tropics with high IQ, notably in Singapore, Lynn does not accept that this fact contradicts his thesis. As he pointed out in *IQ and the Wealth of Nations* (co-author Tatu Vanhanen) the Chinese people of Singapore are relatively recent immigrants. Indeed, Ellsworth Huntington maintained that all the tropical civilisations, including those of the Incas, Khmers and Mayas, were established by migrants from higher latitudes.

The evolutionary theory espoused by Lynn has a distinguished heritage. The German economist Friedrich List (1789-1846) considered mental and physical effort the offspring of a temperate climate. In his *Principles of Economics* (1890) Alfred Marshall described the English in India as a stronger, incoming race from a more stimulating environment. And in *Social Evolution* (1894), the sociologist Benjamin Kidd contended that in the 'stern regions' of the north, men had acquired energy, courage and integrity in a strenuous conflict with nature.

It should be noted that the psychometric evidence that Professor Lynn cites in support of his evolutionary hypothesis would remain valid even if that hypothesis were to fall. One particular item that he adduces is especially compelling. Korean children adopted by Belgian families still exhibit the distinctive pattern of intelligence of East Asian people generally, to wit, strong visualisation ability combined with weaker verbal IQ. Lynn surmises that in winter months in north eastern Asia, these visualisation abilities would once have been essential for hunting and route finding in the snowbound, featureless landscape.

As the author also remarks, it is difficult to see how the higher IQ of Orientals not just in their native countries but also in Canada, Europe and the United States could

be caused by cultural factors. Presumably this is why most commentators studiously ignore this issue.

Reculer pour mieux sauter is now the motto of the London school of psychology, founded by Sir Francis Galton. Thus, in *Race Differences in Intelligence*, Lynn acknowledges the negative effect on IQ of environmental factors, especially poor nutrition, in impoverished African countries. But he contends that even allowing for such factors, African IQ would still only be approximately 80. Like Gobineau, Lynn thinks that Africans were simply not clever enough to initiate a genuine civilisation. They lacked the stimulus of a hard environment.

The author also discusses some significant anomalies arising from his theory. One is the apparent discrepancy between the large average brain size (1,443 cc) and the relatively low IQ (91) of the Arctic peoples. Another is the cultural stagnation of the East Asian peoples after 1500 AD (their mental endowment notwithstanding) as demonstrated by Charles Murray in *Human Accomplishment*.

Those interested in such recondite matters should purchase Lynn's book.

J Philippe Rushton calls this work the culmination of over 25 years research on race differences in intelligence. Indeed, for Richard Lynn, races are everything. Mankind, to quote Oswald Spengler, is merely a "zoological expression".

Leslie Jones is an historian and author

Londonistan

Melanie Phillips, Gibson Square, London, 2006, 300pps, pb, £14.99

Reviewed by Roger Jolly

Melanie Phillips has made a long journey from Left to Right – from *New Society*, the bible of Leftwing social workers, to the *Guardian*, then the *Sunday Times* and now the *Daily Mail*. From defending state welfare and education, she now denounces it. She sees a crumbling society blind to reality, and is alarmed at the destructive effects of multiculturalism.

Britain, she claims, is in denial about the Islamist enemy within. She fulminates against human rights but misunderstands how it works. (This is surprising because her husband Joshua Rozenberg is legal editor of the *Daily Telegraph*.) She criticises human rights for their 'non-religious character', but human rights has always been secular. Particular judges are attacked.

Like a converted zealot, her tone is often strident; the text gives the impression of being hurriedly put together after intensive research and consulting others, rather than real familiarity with the subject. As a result, the civil disturbances in northern towns are not fully analysed and she misses some important details. For instance, many of the terrorists and sympathisers had criminal backgrounds, and such twisted personalities may have been recruited in prison. The unholy alliance between the Left and Muslim fundamentalists, based on moral inversion, is well argued, but she exaggerates the pro-Palestinian bias of the media. The opposite may be more accurate, with one difference: Israel occupied moral high ground from which it has now been dislodged.

Multiculturalism has been damaging, but a government now in office which negotiated with terrorists was compromised to begin with. What is more disturbing is that terrorists and their supporters are being portrayed as 'victims of Islamophobia', while opinion-formers continually proclaim extremists as 'moderates'. The recent revelations about the Muslim Council of Britain, its links with the extremist Muslim Brotherhood, and its direct hotline to government are also of serious concern.

The problem stems from a 1980 document unearthed by others, but quoted by Phillips, which advocated that Muslims settling in Europe should seek to be as separate as possible in order to use it as a basis for future demands. It was produced by the Saudi-backed Islamic Council of Europe in the aftermath of the Islamic revolution in Iran. Wherever there are Muslim communities, the most extreme and reactionary elements have been the most separatist and strident in demanding concessions and benefits from the host community. Now, the extremists have been absorbed, and concessions have continued: faith schools, prison services, faiths and cohesion, *halal* food, special inheritance tax concessions, etc have been implemented without any fanfare or debate. Liberalism, it seems, is its own gravedigger.

While remaining politically neutral she does offer some suggestions: special courts to repeal the Human Rights Act, tightening charity law, new treason laws, closing down extremist mosques and tough immigration controls. But there is no mention of the one party which has consistently sought to expose this threat and called for similar measures, or how its leader has been charged with 'racial hatred' for criticising Islam and is awaiting a repeat show trial at the hands of the same CPS which decided that there was 'insufficient evidence' to charge Muslim extremists.

There is only a cigarette paper between these sets of views but her ambivalence about admitting this is part of the problem. Meanwhile the crisis deepens.

'Roger Jolly' is the pen-name of a member of the Labour Party

THE JOY OF DIVERSITY

**Celebrated
by
Robert
Henderson**

“We’ve done work here which shows that people, frankly, when there aren’t other pressures, like to live within a comfort zone which is defined by racial sameness. People feel happier if they are with people who are like themselves...” Commission for Racial Equality (CRE) chairman Trevor Phillips on the BBC programme *The Happiness Factor*, in June 2006. Out of the mouths of babes and race relations functionaries...

Of course, this is not an honest admission that heterogeneous societies are a bad idea: note the “like to live in a comfort zone” implying that this is weak and self-indulgent behaviour. For people such as Phillips, the admission of what every human being knows in his heart of hearts – that people prefer their own – is merely an acknowledgement of how things are, not how they will always be. Faced with the unfortunate facts of human nature, the answer for the liberal bigot is always ‘more education is needed’. The fact that ‘more education’ has never succeeded in changing human nature is simply

evidence for the liberal bigot that ‘even more education is needed.’

But let us not look a gift horse in the mouth. Apart from being an hilarious Peter Simple character made flesh, our Trevor also has a genius for letting the racial cat

unintentionally out of the bag. During a speech in which he peddled the routine multiculturalist line that racial tensions were being stoked by the ‘far Right’ and that more race riots could be expected, the CRE chairman suddenly let slip “Everyone thinks it’s going to be in the northern towns but it could be anywhere” (*Metro*, 26 May 2006). So there you have it; according to the CRE chairman the whole of the country has become a racial tinderbox.

Some white liberal bigots have got the wind up sufficiently to drop any pretence at multiculturalist waffle. Take the novelist A N Wilson: “We can see that, quite literally, Europe is being invaded before our eyes... There is only one policy which will work, the cruel Spanish one of repatriation... While the politicians of three generations have failed all of us by fearing to be labelled racist, they have allowed the effective dismantling and destruction of our civilisation...” (*Evening Standard*, 19 May 2006).

Of course, as with the followers of all ideologies, some liberal bigots have been left behind and are still forlornly spouting the classic multiculturalist line. In early May, *Telegraph* hack Alice Thomson ventured the opinion (3 May 2006) that if Britain

followed America’s recent lead and had a day’s strike by immigrants “You would have to be living in a yurt and eating nettle soup in the middle of the country not to be affected. From the moment you woke up and tried to turn on the radio and television you would realise something was wrong. Most cab drivers taking presenters into studios are immigrants.” Some cruel souls might think broadcasting studios bereft of liberal bigot presenters would be something of a plus.

The reality is that if such a strike took place the large majority of native Britons would notice very little was happening because most parts of the country still do not have large immigrant populations and the jobs which the multiculturalists are always telling us cannot be filled with indigenous workers are, strangely, filled by just these people in most of the country.

The start of the football World Cup brought forth the usual forest of St George’s flags and the traditional crowd of Anglophobe Celts and quisling members of the English elite shouting their jolly cries of ‘English racism’ at the first public sign of English national sentiment.

The starting gun for the Anglophobe charge was fired by headmistress Karen Healy of Birches Head High School in Stoke, who first banned the flag from her school and then belatedly accepted it after a flood of criticism swept over her (*Metro*, 26 May 2006). The worst World Cup-related Anglophobe incident occurred in Scotland where seven-year-old Hugo Clapshaw was punched on the head in an Edinburgh park for the ‘crime’ of wearing an England shirt (*Daily Telegraph*, 22 June 2006).

The police went off on a jolly jaunt in June when they raided a house in Forest Gate in London after receiving a tip off that its occupants were making a chemical bomb hidden in a jacket for a suicide bomber to use. The house was raided, two brothers, Abul Koyair and Abul Kahar, were taken into custody, one of them after being shot in the shoulder by the police. The house was taken apart. Nothing was found... except £30,000 in cash (16 June 2006). Splendidly thrifty fellows, these Muslims. The two brothers were released without charge. The police swore blind that their informant was considered reliable and hinted the chemical bomb might have been moved. The public as usual were left in the dark.

Whether or not the informant was generally reliable and did or did not give the information believing it to be true is sadly beside the point. The dangerous truth is that MI5 and Special Branch do not have and cannot have the resources to deal with a British Muslim fifth column potentially numbering several million.

In the wildly improbable event that Britain runs short of home-grown terrorists, our quisling elite (quislings in the service of liberal internationalism) have made certain more can come from abroad. The man charged with reviewing Britain’s border security, Lord Carlile of Berriew QC, has concluded that our border controls are paper thin because of a woeful lack of staff: “This kind of manpower weakness is no discouragement to terrorists.... This is still a cause of complaint by Special Branch officers. The adequacy of staffing at HM Customs and Excise at ports of entry of all kinds is an important matter.” (*Daily Telegraph*, 20 June 2006). □



Thrifty brothers: Abul Koyair and Abul Kahar

Robert Henderson’s
personal website may
be found at:
www.anywhere.demon.co.uk

Standardbearers

British Roots of the New Right

A splendid collection of essays on twenty people – writers, visionaries and statesmen – who helped to shape the modern British radical Right. 176pp, pb.

UK Price: £8.95, inc. p&p.

Overseas customers please add £1.00

■ Please send me ☐ copies

The Camp of the Saints

by Jean Raspail

The latest authorised English-language edition of Raspail's prophetic novel about the consequences of unlimited immigration: the destruction of Europe. 316pp, pb.

UK Price: £10.00, inc. p&p.

Overseas customers please add £1.00

■ Please send me ☐ copies

Political Correctness and the Theoretical Struggle

by Frank Ellis

Academic and outspoken writer Frank Ellis traces the roots of political correctness in Bolshevism, in a coruscating book packed with original research and fascinating insights. 86pps, pb, illustrated.

UK price: £10.00 inc p&p.

Overseas customers please add £1.00

■ Please send me ☐ copies

Decline or Dawn?

The speeches at the last RN conference

UK price: £4.50 inc p&p

Overseas customers please add £1.00

■ Please send me ☐ copies

To obtain these books enter the quantity required in the appropriate box above, and complete the form to the right.

Friends of Right Now!

'Friends of Right Now!' recognise the unique position this magazine occupies on the Right, as Britain's most articulate 'politically incorrect' journal. But if *Right Now!* is to become really effective it must be more widely read, especially amongst the opinion-formers in society.

This is where 'Friends of Right Now!' can help. By pledging to support the work of the magazine with regular donations they help us to reach an ever-wider audience. If you are interested in becoming a Friend, then contact us – without any obligation – for more information.

Write to: Box 361, 78 Marylebone High Street, London, W1U 5AP

Tel: (0845) 601 3243

E-mail:

administration@right-now.org

Right Now! – Subscriptions/Orders Form

If you would like to subscribe to *Right Now!*, bulk purchase this issue, purchase back issues or any of the books listed to the left, you can do so in a number of ways:

- Visit our secure website at **www.right-now.org** and pay by credit card
- Telephone/fax your order to **(0845) 601 3243** and pay by credit card
- Complete the form below and post it to us. You can pay by cash/cheque/postal order or international money order, payable to 'Right Now!'
- If you have an account with a UK bank you may subscribe by completing the standing order mandate below. This will save you the inconvenience of annual re-subscription, and you will continue to pay the current rate, even if subscription rates increase in future. Please return the standing order form with the subscription form directly to *Right Now!*

Rates for one copy of the next SIX issues are as follows:

- United Kingdom: £15.00 ■ Europe: £21.00
- Rest of world, air mail: £24.00

■ **Australia & New Zealand** – available directly from: PO Box 220, Brompton, South Australia, 5007. Six issue subscription: A\$42.00

■ **United States and Canada** – available directly from: PO Box 3471, Augusta, GA 30914-3471, USA. Six issue subscription: US\$38.00

■ **OTHER PURCHASES** To purchase any book listed left, please enter quantity required in appropriate box. Please list your requirements for multiple or back issues on a separate sheet of paper, and send the appropriate remittance.

To: Right Now!, Box 361, 78 Marylebone High Street, London, W1U 5AP, UK.

58

Please send me the next SIX issues of *Right Now!* starting with issue no ____.

I enclose payment of £ _____

Name _____

Address _____

Postcode _____

If paying by credit card please complete the following:

Your name as it appears on the card: _____

Type of card (eg Visa, Access etc): _____ Expiry date _____

16 digit card number: _____ - _____ - _____ - _____

Issue number (Switch only) _____

If you wish to give us your e-mail address it will help us to keep you informed about any meetings/activities we are holding. Email address: _____

DATA PROTECTION ACT Under the terms of the Data Protection Act 1998 (United Kingdom) you are advised that we hold our subscription details on a computer database. We do not make this database available to any other person, company or organisation. If you DO NOT WISH to receive any other mailings from Right Now! then please tick this box ☐

STANDING ORDER MANDATE

To: The Manager of the below named Bank.

I, the undersigned, **HEREBY DIRECT** that you pay to the credit of **RIGHT NOW PRESS LIMITED** for the credit of its account (9136-3492) with HSBC Bank PLC at its Chancery Lane and Fleet Street Branch (Sort Code 40-02-07) the sum set out below as the "Amount" on the date of the receipt of this order by you and thereafter on the anniversary thereof in each succeeding year until you receive further notice from me in writing **AND** debit my account accordingly **AND** please quote the reference shown below when making payment to the HSBC Bank.

Bank _____ Bank PLC. Bank Sort Code _____

Branch Address _____

Postcode _____

Account Name: _____ Account No.: _____

Amount: the sum of _____ pounds only. In figures: £ _____.00

Signed: _____ Date: ____/____/20____.

For office use only: Reference: _____

THE GREAT CHILD FRAUD

So, finally, the Child Support Agency is dead. But before we could celebrate the long-overdue demise of this evil organisation the government announced the creation of the zombie son of CSA. Once again Hitler Blair's policy is: 'when in a hole – dig deeper'.

The CSA has, since its inception in 1993, been based upon a fraud: that the problem is one of fathers who up sticks and walk out, irresponsibly leaving behind a desperate and grieving mother and starving child. Even the language used is grossly biased and misleading, and clearly indicates the prejudice that surrounds this issue: 'deadbeat dads', 'feckless fathers', but never any criticism of the mother. The truth is quite the opposite to the myth. The fact is that over 70% of separations are initiated by the woman, and that, once forced out of their homes against their will, fathers have no control over how their children are brought up – and often are even denied any contact with them.

It is therefore hardly surprising that fathers should object to paying so-called 'child support'. There is a wise old proverb: 'he who pays the piper calls the tune'. If a father is paying to maintain his child he should have some control. Any other arrangement amounts to theft, viewing fathers as nothing more than human cash-machines.

Even worse, the current situation is also one of fraud, since there are no checks to ensure that all the money provided by the father does, indeed, get spent on the child, rather than on the mother's shoes, booze and fags. Not only that, but we know that vast numbers of men have been tricked into bringing up another man's child believing it to be their own, and that the CSA refused to conduct checks to confirm fatherhood. Refusing to pay, in these circumstances, is surely the correct approach. The notion that giving a new agency powers to electronically tag fathers who don't pay is typical New Labour soundbite politics. If the father is restricted to his home he will be unable to work, and thus will have no money to give his children! As for allowing mothers who receive payments from their former partners to also receive benefits, this negates the original purpose of the CSA, which was to reduce the cost of single mothers to the public purse.

This whole issue is a complete pig's ear. The only fair solution – both to the parents and to the child – is to have a presumption of shared parenting on separation – unless one parent is clearly unfit for the responsibility. Children would alternate one week with one parent and the following week with the other. Neither parent would pay any money to the other unless they declined to participate, when they would pay a fixed sum (half the actual cost of raising a child) to the full-time parent. Until such a policy is implemented the injustice, and the revolt, will continue.

WALKING BACK TO HAPPINESS

Just as the first spring flower pushing through the snow presages the end of a dark and cold winter,

so the recent talk of happiness in the media and by politicians appears to herald the end of our misguided late 20th century obsession with materialism. Yes, we are wealthier than in the past, and we have more DVDs, MP3s, HDTVs, and every other electronic acronym you can spell than ever before, but we are less happy than we were 50 years ago. The LibLabCon artists that misgovern us forgot that politics should be about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness, and instead substituted the pursuit of GDP.

So, can we now expect a raft of policies from politicians which will make us all happier? Err, no. The 'fly in the ointment', you see, is the fact that the policy which our politicians are most devoted to – immigration – is also the policy which is making us most unhappy. While government advisers talk about certain areas of Britain being "unhealthily all white", Home Office research shows that the contrary is true: the more ethnically diverse an area is the less happy are the people living there. Even the Chairman of the Commission for Racial Equality admits that "people, frankly, when there aren't other pressures, like to live within a comfort zone which is defined by racial sameness".

This is why, when people are liberated from work pressures and can choose where they want to live – rather than having to live in multi-racial cities – they choose to move to the countryside, where levels of immigration are much lower. Over 90% of countryside dwellers were satisfied with their local area; this is hardly surprising since people living in the countryside are generally in more traditional areas of Britain and are most likely to be among people like themselves, or, in the sort of jargon beloved by sociologists, have greater levels of 'bonding social capital'.

An increasing number of Britons, according to recent reports, are taking French leave and retiring to France, where homes are cheaper and where they believe life is "similar to their vision of 1950s Britain". The more thoughtful advocates of 'diversity' accept that heterogeneous societies create problems which can only be solved by putting a lot of effort into bringing different people together. This, however, is unnatural and unstable. So I've got a better idea: why not just have homogeneous communities instead? This is all most of us want. We just want to go back to the future, to a traditional Britain, to a country before uncontrolled mass immigration changed our societies and destroyed our social structures. Happiness is ... a traditional country.

UNIFORMLY STUPID

It would be funny if it wasn't so serious. Following one immigration scandal after another the government has finally decided to take drastic action. Yes, they've ordered some new uniforms. A new border police force is being set up, but it will simply consist of existing immigration and passport control staff, but in shiny new uniforms! I'm sure all illegal immigrants will be terrified now. The government has also promised to reform the Immigration and Nationality Department, but this won't fully take effect for another four years – which gives an indication of how seriously the government treat this issue.

Meanwhile, the immigration free for all continues. Yet another report has confirmed that "Britain is now the top destination for legal immigrants in Europe"; it is thus safe to assume that we are the top destination



By
*John
Bull*

"How few men are strong enough to stand against the prevailing currents of opinion ... Be prepared to stand up faithfully for Right and Truth, however the wind may blow".

Winston Churchill

for illegal immigrants too. Another report reveals that England is the world's fourth most crowded country – and very soon we will move up to third place. This year alone 2.6 million visa applications are expected from people wanting to come here. Only around 20% of these will be tourists (and many of these overstay), and this number does not include the hundreds of thousands coming here who don't need visas (such as those from the EU), nor the tens of thousands of asylum seekers, nor the unknown thousands of illegals. The situation is completely out of control. It was reported that earlier this year Britain's "top immigration judge accused ministers of 'wildly' underestimating the number wanting to enter Britain".

We have, effectively, lost all control over our borders and over immigration controls. What is the difference between what we are facing and an invasion? The Spanish Armada, Napoleon and Hitler all intended to land fewer men in this country than are now arriving each year. There are many reasons why Britain is the world's favourite destination, including our language and the existing ethnic communities, but the major pull is that we are such a soft touch. It emerged recently that Job Centre staff have been instructed to give immigrants National Insurance numbers (meaning they can then work here) even if it is obvious that their documents are forged and they are here illegally. Asylum seekers claiming they are fleeing persecution in their home countries then return there for their holidays, and men and women routinely claim to be homosexual in order to be granted asylum, and then turn out to be heterosexual rapists, or get married and have children. To say that these people are 'taking the Mickey' would be an understatement; Britain is the laughing stock of the world.

Even one of Britain's top military planners has warned about the dangers of immigration. The *Sunday Times* recently reported that Rear Admiral Chris Parry warned that "Europe, including Britain, could be undermined by large immigrant groups with little allegiance to their host countries – a "reverse colonisation" as Parry described it". Anyone who lives in a major British city can see that this is already happening. Indeed, the report confirms that "Parry estimated ... that there were already more than 70 diasporas in Britain. In the future, he believes, large groups that become established in Britain and Europe after mass migration may develop "communities of interest" with unstable or anti-Western regions". Parry may need to couch his words as a warning about the future, but most of us could tell him that we have seen the future – it's here already.

DROP DEAD

Some people still question my claims that the government and media treat men as second class citizens, and that men are the discriminated-against sex, not women. So let me point out that while prostate cancer kills almost as many men each year as breast cancer kills women, spending on breast cancer is 10 times that on prostate cancer. Hardly surprising then that while mortality rates for breast cancer are falling fast, those for prostate cancer are steadily rising. Furthermore, while the NHS will now (quite rightly) make the expensive breast cancer drug Herceptin available to all women who need it, men suffering from prostate cancer are being refused

brachytherapy, which is the treatment *they* need.


Why is there this difference in the way men and women are treated? Why is it that there is a national screening programme for female cancers (breast and cervical) but not for male cancers (prostate and testicular)? This contempt for male lives can be seen in other ways too. The current conflict in the Middle East has had politicians talking mournfully about the deaths of 'innocent women and children'. Err, what about men? Don't their deaths matter? Obviously not. □

John Bull can be contacted at
johnbull@englandmail.com

GET IT EVERY DAY!

John Bull is back online! Yes, once again you can read regular John Bull articles commenting on the news of the day and fundamental political issues on the internet. This is once more regularly updated and is the most controversial and politically incorrect and independent commentary in Britain! You can also post your own comments and let everyone else know what you are thinking. Don't miss it – visit:

www.sirjohnbull.blogspot.com



Dryslwyn Castle

The great castle at Dryslwyn is a fortress in the sky – a stone monument to the power of long-forgotten Welsh warlords, such as Rhys ap Gruffydd and his feuding sons. Dryslwyn stands on the banks of the River Towey, some ten miles from Carmarthen. The river, rich in salmon and sea-trout, meanders in great bends and loops through a green valley and floodplain where dairy herds and anglers may be found. All is peaceful today, in a land that was once known as the Kingdom of Deheubarth. However, in 1287, Earl Edmund of Cornwall laid siege to the castle in the name of King Edward I.

Rhys ap Maredudd, the lord of Dryslwyn, was in revolt against the King, and in the August of that year paid the price for his rebellion as 11,000 men besieged his fortress. Today, only fragments of the once-noble fortifications survive. But to stand in the ruins of Dryslwyn on a summer's day, looking out across Carmarthenshire, is as near as you can get to being in a time machine. Red kites, buzzards and kestrels soar above Deheubarth, and in the distance, the standards and shields of Edmund's army are just coming into view...

Stuart Millson

Sir,
Of recent years, it has been fashionable to blame the Christian religion for wars and troubles. Nobody can deny that, in history, religious labels have been stuck onto many unworthy conflicts in attempts to justify behaviour which was far from Christian.

Yet the 20th Century saw greater massacres of Christians than any other – mostly carried out in the name of materialist ‘scientific socialism’ and the worldwide brotherhood of mankind. Whilst we will never know how many of these countless victims were true martyrs “in a situation of witness for the faith” when they were killed, we do know the motivation of their killers. It was to eradicate Christianity.

The respected *Oxford University Press World Christian Encyclopedia* puts the number of 20th Century Christian martyrs at over 45 million – greater than all the preceding centuries added together. Some 32 million were killed by atheists (mostly communists but also Nazis) and over nine million by Muslims.

And it continues today. Many millions of Christians live in countries where they do not enjoy equal civil rights because of their faith. Bolshevism is dead, but *Jihad* is alive and well. Antonio Socci, the author of *The New Persecuted: Inquiries into Anti Christian Intolerance in the New Century of Martyrs* provides evidence that some 160,000 Christians have been killed every year since 1990, the vast majority by Muslims.

In an age of victim culture, these people are invisible to the Western media. In these circumstances, I think that Professor Ezra Mishan’s plea for some sort of special protection for Islam against ‘blasphemy’ is a bit rich.

**Edward Spalton,
Etwall, Derbyshire**

Sir,
Did you make a mistake in the content of the latest *Right Now*? One article seems completely out of place. Do we have to read, in the one PC-free zone available, a justification for curtailing our right of free

*"It is by benefit of letters that
absent friends are, in a manner,
brought together."
— Seneca*



Write to: The Editor, Right NOW!
Box 361, 78 Marylebone High Street, London, W1U 5AP.
or e-mail: letters@right-now.org
The editor regrets that he cannot answer all correspondence

speech in case we upset the damn Muslims? I can buy the *Guardian* or the *Times* for that.

**Elizabeth Sutherland,
St Alban's**

Sir,
Thank you for printing my article ‘Trusting the schools’ in your March edition. The *Rose Report* came out on March 20th and was a big step in the right direction. It vindicated much of what I have been saying for 30 years – synthetic phonics-first. It also said that (para 100) “..the indications are that when these children do not get a really good start, they are likely to need interventions to enable them to ‘catch up’ and ‘recover’ ground that they should not have lost in the first place” (my emphasis). The report did not go so far as to say in so many words that most of today’s poor reading had resulted from wrong teaching, but it did say that government advice since 1998 (National Literacy Strategy and supplements) has not been the “best way” to teach reading.

We still need a clearer statement to teachers that beginners should not be learning sight words, should not be guessing from a picture to first letter, should not be treating consonant blends (st, pl, fr) as items of themselves. (The NLS devotes a whole term to them, when one or two days would be plenty.)

It is to be hoped that when teachers see the considerable improvement from good phonics-first, they will gradually drop the practices which many survive but actually cripple so many others needlessly. As things stand the current expectation

of 20% having special needs will probably drop to 10%, but to get it down below 3% the harmful “teaching” has to be stopped, once and for ever.

The question still arises, who is re-training the experts? Unless they are re-trained, we can expect any recommended change to be modified, watered down, so as to avoid any confession that things have been badly wrong for a long time! The experts seem to think they can re-train themselves.

It is time government withdrew from this endless regulating, and let schools choose a commercial phonics programme. The Clackmannan study has provided at least one plentifully monitored and reported. Jolly Phonics does well when not contaminated by other ‘methods’. It is time for teachers and schools, to re-think their teaching, perhaps best without pressures from the LEAs which have been so unhelpful for 50 years.

**Mona McNee,
Whiston**

Sir,
I found the interview with Ron Paul (RN 57) particularly interesting, especially his comment on the United Nations: “The UN is inherently illegitimate.” No one can disagree with the *idea* of the United Nations which was formed in the aftermath of the Second World War with the idealistic hope of preventing further wars, but clearly something is wrong when it authorises them. Perhaps I might suggest a comparison. Bernard Shaw once made, in my view, a highly perceptive comment. He said, “The world

is not yet ready for socialism and when it is it won’t be needed.” Surely the same is true of the United Nations. The world is not yet ready for it and if it were it would not be necessary. We live in a world where the problem is putting our own houses in order. That is the only thing that will lead to a truly United Nations.

**John Coleman,
London SW8**

Sir,
The current percentage of the population of Australia descended from the British Isles is probably just under 70% of our total (let’s say two-thirds).

The oldest ethnic organisation representing this group in Australia is the British Australian Community, which has been legally incorporated since 1967. In its early days the BAC (at that time known as the United Kingdom Settlers’ Association) lobbied successfully for the recognition of British trade and professional qualifications in Australia. In more recent years the BAC has campaigned, with varying degrees of success, against the prevailing current of Anglophobia in the Australian media.

If any of your readers have any interest in what is happening in Australia, I suggest that they check out our BAC website, at: www.geocities.com/endeavour_uksa and preferably email me directly at: endeavour_uksa@hotmail.com. Thank you.

**Alan James,
Publicity Officer, British
Australian Community,
South Yarra, Victoria,
Australia**

Sir,
I have great pleasure in renewing my subscription to *Right Now* and enclose the requisite payment. I am also sending you a contribution towards your ‘campaigns fund’. I always find every issue a stimulating read. Compared to the flaccid complacency of just about all of the Left today, *RN* is a beacon of genuinely intelligent and radical political thinking that maintains a formidably consistent high standard of writing and analysis. I am recommending it

to all my Lefty friends to show them what a good political journal is really like (And I don't say this because you published my review!) I also hope to be able to come to your autumn conference, dates/commitments permitting, on national identity. I am an English nationalist rather than a 'British' one, even more so now that Gordon Brown cynically drapes himself in the union flag, but I do respect those who are seeking to fashion a sense of Britishness for this century – though I doubt that something that is popular with our New Labour/global market/liberal bigot/cosmopolitan elite will really be that attractive for the majority of ordinary no-nonsense, pragmatic but loyal Anglo-Saxon people.

I too am shocked by the way Frank Ellis has been treated by Leeds University. If freedom of thought is no longer allowed a place of learning, where for God's sake is it safe at all? In any case his views of inherited intellectual differences is a perfectly respectable and scientifically supported argument in certain quarters. It may not be correct (politically I mean, not scientifically) but of course the Left-liberal bigots have never been interested in truth (in fact they always say 'truth' to show their contempt for it) but simply in herd conformity to their own trendy

nostrums. This line in the sand must be defended at all costs.

The Marxist mind-set I fear is too advanced in the academy, at least in the humanities/social studies parts, for there to be any hope of salvaging genuine scholarship in our places of higher learning. Should the Right not give serious consideration to trying to found its own university, in the same way that Civitas for example have launched their own school, to try and redress the appalling failure of state educational social engineering?

Allan Pond,
Whitley Bay

CFW

CONCERN FOR FAMILY AND WOMANHOOD

Do you believe that the traditional and natural sex roles and the traditional family are best for our society and for the individual, and that feminism has gone too far? Then join us!

Enquiries/leaflets: CFW,
Springfield House,
Chedworth, Cheltenham,
GL54 4AH

Telephone:
01285 720454

Website: www.cfw.org.uk

DATES for your diary

Saturday 7th and Sunday 8th October 2006, Telford International Conference Centre, UKIP conference. Tickets: £24, plus £30 for the dinner on Saturday night. Contact: UKIP, tel 0800 587 6587, visit ukip.org or write to PO Box 9876 Birmingham, B6 4DN.

Saturday 21st October 2006, London, *Right Now* conference on "The Making and Meaning of Britishness". Speakers to include Jean-Philippe Rushton (University of Western Ontario), Frank Ellis and Steve Moxon. Contact: *Right Now*, Box 361, 78 Marylebone High Street, London W1U 5AP, telephone 0845 6901 3243 or e-mail editor@right-now.org.

Friday 27th October – Sunday 29th October 2006, The Skempton Building, Imperial College, Kensington, London, Australian Monarchist League conference on "The Queen, the Realms and Europe". Speakers to include: Philip Davies, MP, Ashley Mote, MEP, Baroness Knight of Collingtree, Leolin Price, CBE, QC and Lindsay Jenkins. Cost £100, plus £75 for Friday night dinner addressed by Lord Tebbit. Contact: The Australian Monarchist League c/o The Royal Society of St George, 127 Sandgate Road, Folkestone, Kent, CT20 2BH, fax +61 2 9328 6274, e-mail: secretary@monarchist.org.au.

A lasting legacy

Right Now! aims to recapture our civilisation from the enemies of the West. This is a long term project, and requires long term commitment from all involved. Central to such long term aims is lasting financial support. By remembering *Right Now!* in your will, you can ensure that the magazine can continue to expand and advance, even after you have gone. To find out more, please:

Write: Box 361, 78 Marylebone High Street,
London, W1U 5AP

Tel: (0845) 601 3243

E-mail:

administration@right-now.org

Can't wait for the next *Right Now*?
Keep up to date by visiting *Right Now* editor
Derek Turner's new, regularly-updated blog
at: www.derekt.squarespace.com

Right then and Right Now! — Back issues of RN!

Back issues of *Right Now!* are available for £2.50 per copy, including post and packing. Please send cheques, postal or international money orders, payable to 'Right Now!', to: *Right Now!*, Box 361, 78 Marylebone High Street, London, W1U 5AP. Payment can also be made by credit card – see page 23.

Issue 39 (Mar/April 2003): Interview: Lord Cranborne, Peter Robinson on the Belfast Agreement, Yasmin Alibhai-Brown, the new puritanism.

Issue 40 (May/June 2003): Interview: Jean-Marie Le Pen, branding, citizenship and immigration, Taki, Havergal Brian.

Issue 43: (Dec 2003/Jan 2004) Politics in the police; room on the Right for two?; Is capitalism conservative anymore?

Issue 46: (June/July 2004) Blair, Iraq and civil society; 'Gender Recognition' – nonsense on stilettos; Writer of the Right – Matthew Arnold.

Issue 47: (Aug/Sept 2004) Interview: Jared Taylor, Hoon's plans for the Forces, Kilroy Silk and the limelight, Writer of the Right – D R Davies.

Issue 48: (Oct/Nov 2004) Interview: Phyllis Schlafly, New Labour embraces McCarthyism, lessons from Macchiavelli, God's frozen people.

Issue 49: (Dec '04/Jan '05) Interview: David Conway, Writer of the Right – Robert H. Benson, the banning of Vlaams Blok.

Issue 50: (Mar/April 2005) Interview with 'Public Enemy No 1' – Nick Griffin, Lèse-majesté – why the Queen is letting the side

down, the Welfare State we're in, New Trade Theory.

Issue 52: (July/August 2005) 'Is it cos they is black?' – the real reasons for black educational underachievement, Debate: for or against euthanasia; Labour's "sullenness against nature".

Issue 53: (September/October 2005) Britain or Britistan? Islamia in the UK; Interview: J Philippe Rushton – the cutting edge of sociobiology; Leeds, a city on the brink.

Issue 54: (November/December 2005) Cubes and cathedrals – the emptiness at the heart of the West, Interviews: Thomas Fleming, Andrew Fraser, Immigration: 1905 and now.

Issue 55: (January/February 2006) The judgement of Paris – on multiracialism, French style; David Cameron – saviour or sexton? The Nick Griffin trial – a Labour view.

Issue 56 (March/April 2006) Interview: George Borjas; Ashley Mote on immigration; Mona McNee on phonics; Derek Turner on 'Peter Simple'; dispatches from Canada and Zimbabwe.

Issue 57 (June/July 2006) Interview: Congressman Ron Paul on the Federal Reserve; Multiculturalism – wounded but not dead yet; Frank Ellis – a case study in censorship.

New from THE OCCIDENTAL PRESS

A once-in-a-generation book that examines America's racial realities

Race and the American Prospect

Essays on the Racial Realities
of Our Nation and Our Time

Edited by Samuel Francis

Race and the American Prospect correctly points out the rareness of successful multiracial or even biracial societies and shows how the pursuit of this ideal in the U.S. has brought the increasing self-degradation of the majority white population. The authors may be wrong in their predictions but if they are, a convincing refutation has yet to be produced.

—PAUL GOTTFRIED
ELIZABETHTOWN COLLEGE

Race and the American Prospect is one of those books you don't want to put down. Buy an extra copy for family members or friends who need a powerful and persuasive introduction to the problems posed by race and racial differences everywhere in the modern West. Even the cognoscenti will discover a rich new store of fascinating insights and perspectives in this remarkable book.

—ANDREW FRASER
MACQUARIE UNIVERSITY

Race and the American Prospect

Essays on the Racial Realities of Our Nation and Our Time

EDITED BY SAMUEL FRANCIS, PH.D.

Politics/Social Science

\$34.95 (HB); \$19.95 (PB) + \$3 shipping

462 pp. (foreword, afterword, index)

Fourteen authors—leading scholars and experts on race and ethnicity—reflect on how race and ethnic differences have shaped America's cultural, historical, and political landscape. Each contributor examines the impact of racial differences on American society, from religion and politics to Southern history and sociobiology, and explains the significance of race as a crucial factor in forging America's national character.

CONTENTS INCLUDE: The Reality of Race; Racial Differences in Intelligence, Personality and Behavior; The Costs of Racial Pluralism; The Racial Revolution; Immigration and Race; Race and the South; Jews, Blacks, and Race; Race And Religion; The Dis-United Kingdom; Race and the Left; Race in Philosophy; and Racial Preservation

THE OCCIDENTAL PRESS • P.O. Box 695 • Mt. Airy, MD 21771
Ph: 301-829-2995; F: 301-829-2911 • www.occidentalpress.com

